chartered savings and loan associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

223. Also, petition of the Rocky Mountain National Fur Growers Association, Denver, Colo., protesting against excise tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

224. By Mr. STEFAN: Resolution adopted by the Surety National Farm Loan Association of Dodge, Nebr., respecting fuller exercise by Congress of its power to coin and regulate money; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

225. Also, resolution adopted by the Surety National Farm Loan Association of Dodge, Nebr., asking Congress to establish a permanent rate of 4-percent interest on farm mortgages made through the Federal Farm Credit System; to the Committee on Agriculture.

226. Also, resolution adopted by the Surety National Farm Loan Association of Dodge, Nebr., asking Congress for a thorough investigation of the meat-packing business in the United States as it relates to the interests of livestock producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

227. By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of Senate of the State of New York, asking that the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States be requested to supplement the regulations made by New York State pertaining to the production, handling, and marketing of milk within the State by making effective at the earliest possible date such Federal regulations as will place milk produced in other States and marketed within the State of New York under similar regulations to those applied by the State to milk produced within its borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

228. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, asking that the Congress of the United States and the Postmaster General of the United States be respectfully memorialized to take appropriate action to the end that the Floyd Bennett Field Airport in the borough of Brooklyn, State of New York, be designated as an air mail service station for the city of New York and the environs of such city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

229. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of New York, memorializing the United States Congress to consider legislation looking to either taking all profits out of war or putting the business of manufacturing munitions of war solely in the hands of the United States Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

230. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Local Union No. 231, of the United Mine Workers of America, organized into a bona fide trade union, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, hereby requesting the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, of the State of New York, to again introduce his labor-disputes bill, in its original form, at the convening session of Congress; to the Committee on Labor.

231. Also, petition of District Five Conference of the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Fraternity, by their district representative, Don C. Rogers, urging the National Congress first to appropriate sufficient additional funds for the Public Works Administration to permit an extensive school-building construction program, and, second, to authorize such a ratio of financial contribution toward the construction of school buildings that the Federal Government will provide a larger proportion of the cost than at present; to the Committee on Appropriations.

232. Also, petition of Division No. 168 (Lima, Ohio), Benefit Association of Railway Employees, by their secretary, Frank Dobner, requesting that the Honorable CHARLES V. TRUAX, Member of Congress from the State of Ohio, be requested by this body, consisting of 775 railway employees, exclusive of their families, to support to the fullest extent enactment of legislation to modify the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act to regulate commerce so as to permit the railroads to compete with unregulated forms of transportation as recommended by the Federal Coordinator and covered in the Pettengill bill (H. R. 8100) introduced at the last session of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

233. Also, petition of Local Union No. 527 of the International Union of Operating Engineers, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, requesting that Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of the State of New York, again introduce his labor-disputes bill in its original form at the convening session of Congress; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 18, 1935

(Legislative day of Thursday, Jan. 17, 1935)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal for the calendar day Thursday, January 17, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statues of Caesar Rodney and John M. Clayton, presented by the State of Delaware and placed in Statuary Hall, are accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered the State for the contribution of the statues of two of its most eminent citizens whose names are so thoroughly identified with the State and Nation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions suitably engrossed and duly authenticated be transmitted to the Governor of Delaware.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. COSTIGAN. From the Committee on Finance I report back favorably the nomination of Miss Josephine A. Roche, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. GUFFEY, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of James L. O'Toole, Jr., of Pittsburgh, Pa., to be collector of internal revenue for the twenty-third district of Pennsylvania, in place of David L. Lawrence, resigned.

Mr. HARRISON, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of Sigmund Solomon, of New York, N. Y., to be superintendent of the United States assay office at New York, N. Y., in place of Niles R. Becker.

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably the nomination of Joseph S. Buford, of New York, N. Y., to be assayer of the United States assay office at New York, N. Y., in place of Burt G. Shields, resigned.

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably the nomination of Harry M. Brennan, of Louisville, Ky., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky., to fill an existing vacancy.

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably the nominations of the following collectors of internal revenue:

Philemon C. Merrill, of Safford, Ariz., for the district of Arizona, to fill an existing vacancy;

Fred C. Martin, of Bennington, Vt., for the district of Vermont, to fill an existing vacancy; and

Joseph T. Higgins, of New York, for the third district of New York, to fill an existing vacancy.

Mr. HARRISON also, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers in the Public Health Service.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. POPE, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, reported favorably the nomination of John Wellington Finch, of Idaho, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, he having been appointed during the recess of the Senate, vice Scott Turner, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Coolidge	King	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Copeland	La Follette	Reynolds
Austin	Costigan	Lewis	Robinson
Bachman	Couzens	Logan	Russell
Bailey	Davis	Lonergan	Schall
Bankhead	Dieterich	Long	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Donahey	McCarran	Sheppard
Barkley	Duffy	McGill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Fletcher	McNary	Smith
Black	Frazier	Maloney	Steiwer
Bone	Gerry	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Glass	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Gore	Moore	Townsend
Bulow	Guffey	Murphy	Trammell
Burke	Hale	Murray	Truman
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hastings	Norris	Van Nuys
Capper	Hatch	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Clark	Johnson	Pittman	Wheeler
Connally	Keyes	Pope	White

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] is absent in the Philippines on the business of the Senate; that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] is unavoidably detained; and that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] is absent on account of a death in his family.

I wish further to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LEWIS. I announce the absence of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], who is detained on official business, and the absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], occasioned by illness.

I reannounce the absence of the Senator from California [Mr. MCADOO], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator-elect from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] on the Philippine Commission, they not having returned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

As in legislative session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of papers and documents on the files of the Post Office Department which are not needed in the transaction of public business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and asking for action looking toward their disposition, which, with the accompanying schedule, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. TRAMMELL and Mr. SCHALL the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

As in legislative session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the City Council of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation and the making of such appropriations as may be necessary to create a Federal agency to take over all assets and liabilities of closed banks in the United States and pay each depositor the full amount of his deposit, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Louisiana Bottlers Association, of Bogalusa; the Police Jury Association of Louisiana, of Monroe; and the Louisiana Motor Transportation Association, of New Orleans, all in the State of Louisiana, favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the Federal tax of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline and to leave to the States the exclusive right to tax gasoline, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROBINSON presented a letter in the nature of a petition from the director of highways, Arkansas State Highway Commission, of Little Rock, Ark., recommending that certain principles be incorporated in any legislation making funds available for railroad grade-crossing work, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HALE presented numerous petitions of citizens of the State of Maine, praying for publication at Government expense of the testimony taken by the Federal Communications Commission, Broadcast Division, in relation to the broadcasting of programs of public interest, convenience, and necessity, together with the report of the Commission, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by the Common Council of Middletown; and papers in the nature of petitions from Local No. 574, Carpenters and Joiners of America; Local No. 207, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers; and Local No. 133, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Middletown, in the State of New York, praying that preference be given to employees and contractors of Orange County and Middletown, N. Y., upon construction and other work at the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Franklin Society, of New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation removing the exemption from taxation of the dividends paid on the shares of Federal savings and loan associations or granting a similar exemption to such associations operating under State charters, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Hornell Division, No. 83, of Hornell, N. Y., and Port Jervis Division, No. 82, of Matamoras, Pa., both of the Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, favoring the enactment of legislation modifying the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit railroads to compete with unregulated forms of transportation, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of employees of the Rochester (N. Y.) office of the Reece Button Hole Machine Co., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called "Black-Connery" 30-hour work week bill or any other such measure designed to limit further by statute the working hours per week in industry, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Niagara Falls, N. Y., urging the manufacture of munitions by the Government, the imposition of a 95-percent tax on all incomes in excess of $10,000 in time of war, prohibiting the use of the American flag on boats carrying munitions to foreign ports, and the limitation and reduction of armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the League of Nations Association, Inc., of New York City, N. Y., favoring the ratification of the World Court protocols, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I present petitions from the Lexington Townsend Club, purporting to represent 60 percent of the voters of Lexington, Mass.; from the Townsend Club of Woburn, Mass., purporting to represent 1,500 voters; and from the Townsend Club of Reading, Mass., purporting to represent 3,000 voters, urging adoption of the so-called "Townsend old-age pension plan." I ask that the telegram from the Lexington Townsend Club be printed in the RECORD, and that these petitions be referred to the Senate Finance Committee.

The petitions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and the one from the Lexington Townsend Club was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEXINGTON, MASS., *January 17, 1935.*

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

The Lexington Townsend Club have names of 60 percent of voters in this town petitioning you to vote for the Townsend plan and work to enact same into law this session of Congress. Therefore vote against the administration social security program and accept no compromise.

LEXINGTON TOWNSEND CLUB,
MARTHA C. SPAULDING, *Secretary.*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

As in legislative session,

Mr. BULKLEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 267) for the relief of cer-

tain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of nature, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 15) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

As in legislative session,

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 1165) to prevent discrimination against certain distressed home owners on account of the different methods that have been employed in the various States for financing public improvements; to avoid penalizing worthy properties in special improvement districts; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 1166) granting a pension to Mary E. Laycock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 1167) to amend the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 1168) for the relief of Horace G. Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1169) to deepen the irrigation channel between Clear Lake and Lost River, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. McGILL:

A bill (S. 1170) for the relief of Mike L. Sweeney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1171) granting a pension to Lucy Copeland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 1172) granting a pension to J. E. Barrows; and

A bill (S. 1173) granting a pension to Sarah E. Foster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 1174) for the relief of Sidney M. Blackburn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. FLETCHER introduced Senate bill 1175, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DAVIS:

A bill (S. 1176) for the relief of Thomas A. Coyne; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 1177) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in classified civil service, and for other purposes, approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof", approved July 3, 1926, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. METCALF:

A bill (S. 1178) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Providence, R. I.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 1179) for the relief of James H. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. WALSH also introduced Senate bill 1180, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD:

A bill (S. 1181) for the relief of First Lt. R. G. Cuno;

A bill (S. 1182) for the relief of William E. Smith; and

A bill (S. 1183) for the relief of Roland P. Winstead; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BONE:

A bill (S. 1184) for the relief of Harry J. Tucker; to the Committee on Civil Service.

A bill (S. 1185) for the relief of Charles Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1186) for the relief of Frank P. Ross; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A bill (S. 1187) granting a pension to Theresa Elizabeth Mapes;

A bill (S. 1188) granting a pension to J. C. Ruark; and

A bill (S. 1189) granting a pension to William J. Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. CONNALLY introduced Senate bill 1190, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining, and which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 1191) restoring the United States naval station at Key West, Fla., to an active status and authorizing an appropriation for its maintenance; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 1192) to authorize additional expenditures by the District of Columbia-Virginia Boundary Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 1193) to amend section 22 (g) of the Federal Reserve Act relating to loans to executive officers of member banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 35) for the relief of W. K. Richardson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. GORE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 36, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, and appears under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF FUNCTIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

As in legislative session,

Mr. FLETCHER. I introduce a bill to extend the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and so forth, and ask to have the bill, along with a synopsis of it and explanation of it, printed in the RECORD at the same time.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1175) to extend the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 2 years; to authorize loans or renewals or extensions to mature not later than January 31, 1945; to empower the Corporation to buy railroad obligations, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in aid of railroad reorganization and in certain other circumstances; to empower the Corporation (a) to aid the mortgage situation generally by the purchase of nonassessable stock in mortgage loan companies and similar financial institutions, and to authorize the sale of stock, capital notes, or debentures purchased by the Corporation; and (b) to purchase any portion of the assets of closed banks under certain conditions; to increase the authorized investments in preferred stock and capital notes of insurance companies, or loans thereon, from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000; to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Export-Import Banks of Washington, D. C., as agencies of the United States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, with the accompanying synopsis and explanation, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[S. 1175, in the Senate of the United States, 74th Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to extend the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 2 years; to authorize loans, or renewals, or extensions to mature not later than January 31, 1945; to empower the Corporation to buy railroad obligations, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in aid of railroad reorganization, and in certain other circumstances; to empower the Corporation (a) to aid the mortgage situation generally by the purchase of nonassessable stock in mortgage loan companies and similar financial institutions, and to authorize the sale of stock, capital notes, or debentures purchased by the Corporation; and (b) to purchase any portion of the assets of closed banks under certain conditions; to increase the authorized investments in preferred stock and capital notes of insurance companies, or loans thereon, from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000; to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Export-Import Banks of Washington, D. C., as agencies of the United States; and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That until February 1, 1937, or such earlier date as the President may fix by proclamation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized to continue to perform

all functions which it is authorized to perform under law, and the liquidation and winding up of its affairs as provided for by section 13 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, are hereby postponed during the period that the functions of the Corporation are continued pursuant to this act.

SEC. 2 (a). Except as provided in section 9 of "An act relating to direct loans for industrial purposes by Federal Reserve Banks, and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1934, no funds shall be disbursed on any commitment or agreement hereafter made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make a loan or advance, subscribe for stock, or purchase capital notes or debentures, after the expiration of 1 year from the date of such commitment or agreement; but within the period of such 1-year limitation no provision of law terminating any of the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be construed to prohibit disbursement of funds on commitments or agreements to make loans or advances, subscribe for preferred stock, or purchase capital notes or debentures.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, disbursement may be made at any time prior to January 31, 1936, on any commitment or agreement heretofore made by the Corporation to make a loan or advance, subscribe for preferred stock, or purchase capital notes or debentures.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law limiting the maturity of obligations taken by it to shorter periods, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may make loans or advances or renewals or extensions thereof to authorized borrowers or by other suitable agreement permit them to run so as to mature at such time or times as the Corporation may determine, not later than January 31, 1945: *Provided*, That in respect of loans or renewals or extensions of loans or purchases of obligations under section 5 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as heretofore and herein amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 15, ch. 14), to or of railroads, the Corporation may require as a condition of making any such loan or renewal or extension for a period longer than 5 years, or purchasing any such obligation maturing later than 5 years from the date of purchase by the Corporation, that such arrangements be made for the reduction or amortization of the indebtedness of the railroad, either in whole or in part, as may be approved by the Corporation after the prior approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

SEC. 4. Section 5 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 15, ch. 14), is further amended by striking out all of the third sentence of the third paragraph thereof through the first colon and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Within the foregoing limitations of this section, the Corporation, notwithstanding any limitation of law as to maturity, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including approval of the price to be paid, may, to aid in the financing, reorganization, consolidation, maintenance, or construction thereof, purchase for itself, or for account of a railroad obligated thereon, the obligations of railroads engaged in interstate commerce, including equipment-trust certificates, or guarantee the payment of the principal of, and/or interest on, such obligations, including equipment-trust certificates, or, when, in the opinion of the Corporation, funds are not available on reasonable terms through private channels, make loans, upon full and adequate security, to such railroads or to receivers or trustees thereof for the purposes aforesaid: *Provided*, That in the case of loans to or the purchase or guarantee of obligations, including equipment-trust certificates, of railroads not in receivership or trusteeship, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall, in connection with its approval thereof, also certify that such railroad, on the basis of present and prospective earnings, may reasonably be expected to meet its fixed charges, without a reduction thereof through judicial reorganization, except that such certificate shall not be required in case of such loans made for the maintenance of or purchase of equipment for such railroads: *And provided further*, That for the purpose of determining the general funds of the Corporation available for further loans or commitments, such guaranties shall, to the extent of the principal amount of the obligations guaranteed, be interpreted as loans or commitments for loans":

SEC. 4a. Section 5 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 15, ch. 14), is further amended by striking out at the end of the third paragraph thereof the colon and the proviso. "*Provided further*, That the Corporation may make said loans to trustees of railroads which proceed to reorganize under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act of March 3, 1933", and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 5. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 15, ch. 14) is further amended by inserting after section 5b thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5c. To assist in the reestablishment of a normal mortgage market, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may, upon the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, subscribe for or make loans upon the nonassessable stock of any class of any mortgage loan company, trust company, savings and loan association, or other similar financial institution, now or hereafter incorporated under the laws of the United States, or of any State, or of the District of Columbia, the principal business of which institution is that of making loans upon mortgages, deeds of trust, or other instruments conveying, or constituting a lien upon, real estate or any interest therein. In any case in which, under the laws of its incorporation, such financial institution is not permitted to issue nonassessable stock, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized, for the purposes of this section, to purchase the legally issued capital notes or debentures of such financial institutions. Notwithstanding any other provision of law the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe (which regulations shall include at least 60 days' notice of any proposed sale to the issuer or maker), sell, at public or private sale, the whole or any part of the stock, capital notes, or debentures acquired by the Corporation pursuant to this section, and the preferred stock, capital notes, or debentures acquired pursuant to any other provision of law."

SEC. 6. Section 5e (a) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 15, ch. 14), is amended

(1) By inserting in the first sentence thereof after the words "the assets" and before the words "of any bank", the following: ", or any portion thereof,";

(2) By inserting in the second sentence thereof after the words "such assets" and before the words "held for the benefit" the following: ", or any portion thereof,".

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Commodity Credit Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware as an agency of the United States pursuant to the Executive order of the President of October 16, 1933, shall continue, until April 1, 1937, or such earlier date as may be fixed by the President by Executive order, to be an agency of the United States. During the continuance of such agency, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of Farm Credit Administration are authorized and directed to continue, for the use and benefit of the United States, the present investment in the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Corporation is hereby authorized to use all its assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all moneys which have been or may hereafter be allocated to or borrowed by it, in the exercise of its functions as such agency, including the making of loans on agricultural commodities.

SEC. 8. Section 1 of "An act to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to subscribe for preferred stock and purchase the capital notes of insurance companies, and for other purposes", approved June 10, 1933, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 15, ch. 14, sec. 605e) is amended by striking from the last sentence thereof "$50,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75,000,000."

SEC. 9. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Export-Import Bank of Washington and the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., banking corporations organized under the laws of the District of Columbia as agencies of the United States pursuant to Executive orders of the President, shall continue, until June 16, 1937, or such earlier date as may be fixed by the President by Executive order, to be agencies of the United States and in addition to existing charter powers, and without limitation as to the total amount of obligations thereto of any borrower, endorser, acceptor, obligor, or guarantor at any time outstanding, said banking corporations are hereby authorized and empowered to discount notes, drafts, bills of exchange, and other evidences of debt for the purpose of aiding in the financing and facilitating exports and imports and the exchange of commodities between the United States and any of its territories and insular possessions and any foreign country or the agencies or nationals thereof, and, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to borrow money and rediscount notes, drafts, bills of exchange, and other evidences of debt for the purposes aforesaid. During the continuance of such agencies the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce are authorized and directed to continue, for the use and benefit of the United States, the present investment in the capital stock of said banking corporations.

SEC. 10. No obligations, contingent or absolute, shall be incurred for the expenditure or other disposition of funds heretofore, hereby, or hereafter appropriated, or otherwise obtained for the carrying out of functions of Reconstruction Finance Corporation unless within estimates of such obligations and expenditures approved by the Director of the Budget, and, to the extent that the Secretary of the Treasury may consider practicable, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, there shall be maintained on the books of the Treasury Department such accounts as may be necessary to give full force and effect to this provision.

The synopsis and explanation referred to are as follows:

SYNOPSIS OF DRAFT BILL EXTENDING THE FUNCTIONS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1: Extends the functions of the Corporation until February 1, 1937, subject to prior termination at such earlier date as the President, by proclamation, may determine.

Section 2: Puts a 1-year limitation on disbursement of future commitments (except commitments to aid in the completion, repair, or improvement of self-liquidating projects heretofore financed under the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932) by the Corporation, and authorizes the disbursement of past commitments at any time prior to January 31, 1936.

Section 3: Authorizes the Corporation to make loans or renewals with maturities up to January 31, 1945, instead of January 31, 1940, as now provided.

Section 4: Authorizes the Corporation, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission and with certain other limitations, for the purpose of aiding in the financing, reorganization, consolidation, maintenance, or construction of railroads, to purchase or guarantee railroad obligations, including equipment-trust certificates, or to make loans to railroads, receivers, or trustees thereof upon full and adequate security.

Section 4a: Eliminates a duplication which will exist in section 5 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, if the amended section 4 herein proposed is adopted.

Section 5: Authorizes the Corporation, when requested by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, to purchase stock in mortgage-loan institutions (the same as in banks and insurance companies) for the purpose of aiding in the reestablishment of a normal mortgage market. It also authorizes the Corporation to sell, under certain conditions, the stock, capital notes, or debentures acquired pursuant to this section, and the preferred stock, capital notes, or debentures of banks heretofore or hereafter purchased.

Section 6: Section 5e now authorizes the Corporation to purchase all of the assets of a closed bank under certain conditions. The proposed section 5e would authorize the Corporation to purchase any portion of, as well as all of, the assets of such closed banks.

Section 7: Authorizes the continuance until April 1, 1937, of the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the Government.

Section 8: Authorizes an increase in the total funds of the Corporation which may be invested in purchases of, or loans on, preferred stock and capital notes of insurance companies from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000.

Section 9: Authorizes the continuance until June 16, 1937, of the export-import banks as agencies of the Government and broadens the powers of these banks, subject to certain restrictions.

Section 10: Places in the Director of the Budget determination of the expenditures which shall be made by the Corporation, notwithstanding the availability of funds authorized by Congress.

EXPLANATION OF DRAFT BILL

SECTION 1

Section 1 of the draft bill would extend the lending power and other active functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 2 years beyond the present date of expiration of such power. Under the original Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, approved January 22, 1932, the Corporation was permitted to make loans at any time prior to the expiration of 1 year from the date of enactment of such act, and the President was given power to postpone such date of expiration for an additional 1 year. The President subsequently exercised such power, and the life of the Corporation was extended up to January 22, 1934.

In "An act to continue the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to provide additional funds for the Corporation, and for other purposes", approved January 20, 1934, Congress authorized the Corporation to "continue to perform all functions which it is authorized to perform under existing law" until February 1, 1935.

Section 1 of the draft bill would again postpone the date of the expiration of the Corporation's lending functions until February 1, 1937, or such earlier date as the President might fix by proclamation.

SECTION 2

Section 2 (a) is a reenactment with certain clarifying and necessary changes of section 2 of "An act to continue the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to provide additional funds for the Corporation, and for other purposes", approved January 20, 1934.

There has been some doubt as to whether the term "loan or advance", as used in section 2 of such act, is sufficiently broad to include subscriptions for preferred stock or purchases of capital notes or debentures, and accordingly the language of the section has been broadened so as to include these other functions of the Corporation.

The proposed section 2 expressly excepts from the operation of the section commitments made under section 9 of the so-called "Industrial Loan Act", approved June 19, 1934. Such section 9 authorizes the Corporation to make further loans in connection with "self-liquidating" loans made by it prior to June 26, 1933, for improvements, extensions, etc., to projects so financed. Owing to the nature of the work performed with the proceeds of this type of loan, it is felt that it would be unsatisfactory to require disbursement of loans under section 9 within a 1-year period from the making of the commitment.

Section 2 (b) provides that the Corporation may make disbursement on account of any commitment heretofore made to make a loan or subscribe to preferred stock or purchase capital notes or debentures at any time prior to January 31, 1936. Under existing law such disbursement may be made only up to the expiration of 1 year after the date of the commitment.

There are many situations, as in the case of receivers' loans, where it has been found, through no fault of the borrower, that disbursement within 1 year from date of the commitment is either impossible or inconvenient. Unless the period of disbursement is extended to take care of such cases, each case will have to be submitted to the board of directors and a new loan made. This would, of course, involve a great amount of inconvenience and delay.

SECTION 3

This section of the draft bill would permit the Corporation to make loans for sufficiently long periods to enable borrowers to repay the Corporation without the drag on business activities which might be attendant upon too rapid utilization of capital for such repayments.

Section 3 of the draft bill provides for loans or advances or renewals or extensions thereof to mature not later than January 31, 1945, instead of February 1, 1940, as under existing law.

This section contains a proviso that as a condition of making loans to railroads or railways, or purchasing the obligations thereof, for a period longer than 5 years the Corporation may require:

"That such arrangements be made for the reduction or amortization of the indebtedness of the railroad, either in whole or in part, as may be approved by the Corporation after the prior approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission."

This proviso is considered to adequately protect the Corporation's interest in connection with these long-term loans, and is in accordance with the plan for the scaling down of the debt structure of railroads and railways approved by the President.

SECTION 4

This section of the draft bill is designed to clarify and broaden somewhat the power of the Corporation to be of assistance to the railroads of the country. It proposes to add certain new words to section 5 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to permit the Corporation, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to purchase for itself, or for account of a railroad obligated thereon, obligations, including equipment trust certificates, of railroads engaged in interstate commerce, in addition to the making of loans to such railroads which the Corporation is at present authorized to make.

Section 4 of the draft bill would authorize the Corporation, in addition, to guarantee the payment of the principal of, and/or interest on, such obligations.

In lieu of the present phrase, "to aid in the temporary financing", the following language has been inserted in section 4: "To aid in the financing, reorganization, consolidation, maintenance, or construction." This language is designed to clarify the position of the Corporation in regard to the assistance which it may give to railroads and railways, and to somewhat enlarge the scope of such assistance.

The first proviso requires the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the case of loans to or the purchase or guarantee of obligations of railroads not in receivership, to certify that such railroad, on the basis of present and prospective earnings, may reasonably be expected to meet its fixed charges without the necessity of a reduction thereof through judicial reorganization. This certificate is not required in the case of loans for the maintenance of, or purchase of equipment for, such railroads, since such loans might be advisable without such a certificate, because they would provide work.

The second proviso at the end of the proposed amendment would require the Corporation to interpret as loans or commitments for loans any guaranties made pursuant to this section, to the extent of the principal amount of the obligations guaranteed.

The reason for including this certification in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act is that the requirement for certification of such loans is not included in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, but is part of the Emergency Railroad Transportation Act of 1933, which provides in part as follows (sec. 15):

"The Commission shall not approve a loan to a carrier under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, if it is of the opinion that such carrier is in need of financial reorganization in the public interest."

The continuance of such provision seems desirable, but at present it will expire June 16, 1935, unless renewed. The proviso in the draft bill is more specific than the above section 15 in that it deals with fixed charges rather than the vague and uncertain term "in need of financial reorganization." The proviso thus furnishes the Commission with a more definite standard on which to base its approval or disapproval of R. F. C. assistance to railroads.

SECTION 4 (A)

This section of the draft bill would eliminate the proviso contained in section 5 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, which authorizes the Corporation to make loans under section 5 to trustees of railroads under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. Such proviso is no longer necessary in view of the use of the word "trustee" in section 4 of the draft bill.

SECTION 5

Section 5 of the draft bill would add a new section to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, to be known as section 5 (c). This section would give the Corporation the power to assist in the reestablishment of a normal mortgage market by subscribing, upon the request of the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President, to the nonassessable stock of mortgage-loan companies, trust companies, savings-and-loan associations, and other similar financial institutions whose principal business is that of making real-estate mortgage loans. It also authorizes the Corporation to sell, under certain conditions, the stock, capital notes, or debentures acquired pursuant to this section or any other provision of law.

The Corporation is of the opinion that the reestablishment of a Nation-wide market for sound real-estate mortgages is an important element in recovery. The proposed amendment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act would enable the Corporation to be of assistance to this field.

SECTION 6

This section of the draft bill is designed to clear up an ambiguity in the language of section 5e (a) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended. Such section 5e (a) authorizes the Corporation to "make loans upon or purchase the assets" of closed banks and to make loans upon or purchase assets of closed banks which have been trusteed for the benefit

of depositors. Some doubt has arisen in interpreting the language of this section as to whether the term "assets" means necessarily all the assets of a closed bank or whether it would permit the purchase merely of a portion thereof. In order to clear up this ambiguity the words "or any portion thereof" have been added after the word "assets" in the two places in the section where necessary.

SECTION 7

This section of the draft bill would continue the status of the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until April 1, 1937, or such earlier date as may be fixed by the President.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was organized under the laws of Delaware, pursuant to an Executive order of the President, dated October 16, 1933. The capital stock was subscribed for by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, and is held by them in trust for the United States. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is the principal creditor of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because of the loans it makes to it under section 201 (d) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932.

The authority for the creation of the Commodity Credit Corporation is found in section 2 of title I of the National Industrial Recovery Act, which provides: "To effectuate the policy of this title the President is hereby authorized to establish such agencies, * * * as he may find necessary, * * *." Such section further provides, however, that "This title shall cease to be in effect and any agencies established hereunder shall cease to exist at the expiration of 2 years after the date of enactment of this act, * * *." The effect of this language is that on June 16, 1935, without any new legislation, the Commodity Credit Corporation would probably cease to be an agency of the United States.

It is felt, however, that the Commodity Credit Corporation still has many necessary functions to perform, and that its life should be extended as provided in section 7 of the draft bill.

SECTION 8

The Corporation, as of January 15, 1935, has authorized the investment of $100,000 in purchases of preferred stock of insurance companies and the investment of $35,775,000 in loans on preferred stock and capital notes of such insurance companies, making a total of $35,875,000. Under the existing act there is a limitation of $50,000,000 on the amount of funds of the Corporation which may be invested in such purchases or loans. Applications now pending before the Corporation and others in immediate prospect indicate that the entire balance of the fund will be more than absorbed. It is believed that an additional $25,000,000 is required to take care of pending and future legitimate requests.

SECTION 9

This section of the draft bill would continue the status of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., as agencies of the United States until June 16, 1937, or such earlier date as may be fixed by the President.

The Export-Import Bank of Washington was organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, pursuant to Executive order of the President dated February 2, 1934. The bank was capitalized at $11,000,000, of which the preferred stock of $10,000,000 was subscribed for by this Corporation and the money for the common stock of $1,000,000 was made available from the funds provided by section 220 of the National Industrial Recovery Act.

The Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., was organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, pursuant to Executive order of the President dated March 9, 1934. The total authorized capital of $2,750,000 is divided into $250,000 common stock, subscribed for out of the funds made available by section 220 of the National Industrial Recovery Act, and $2,500,000 preferred stock subscribed for by this Corporation.

The authority for the creation of both of these banks is found in section 2 of title I of the National Industrial Recovery Act, which provides:

"To effectuate the policy of this title, the President is hereby authorized to establish such agencies * * * as he may find necessary * * *."

Such section further provides that "this title shall cease to be in effect, and any agencies established hereunder shall cease to exist, at the expiration of 2 years after the date of the enactment of this act * * *." The effect of this language is that on June 16, 1935, without any new legislation, the Export-Import Bank of Washington and the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., would probably cease to be agencies of the United States.

Section 9 of the draft bill is also designed to correct certain legal inhibitions in the banking laws of the District of Columbia which seriously hamper the operations of the export-import banks.

If a Government-owned bank for financing export and import trade is to become a part of our domestic economy, it should be given a status which would permit it to carry on its business unhampered by constant doubts as to the extent of its authority and without the embarrassment of unnecessary legal restrictions.

In the first place, the District of Columbia Code forbids the organization of banks of discount. The power to discount is, however, one of the most important functions of a modern banking institution, and the draft bill would remedy this situation by specifically giving the export-import banks the power to discount or rediscount notes and other obligations. This section also authorizes the banks to borrow money and rediscount obligations with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The District of Columbia Code applies section 5200 of the National Bank Act to all banks doing business in the District of Columbia, thus limiting loans to any one borrower to 10 percent of the bank's unimpaired capital and surplus. This provision has no proper application, however, to foreign banking where advances of large sums against shipping documents is common practice. Because of the limited capital of the Second Export-Import Bank the limitations of section 5200 have been particularly onerous, and the draft bill provides for the making of loans without limitation as to the total amount of obligations thereto of any borrower.

SECTION 10

This section was inserted at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury. It places in the Director of the Budget determination of the expenditures which shall be made by the Corporation notwithstanding the availability of funds authorized by Congress.

EXPANSION OF COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

As in legislative session,

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend section 4865 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, which in effect increases the number of beneficiaries from the several States and Territories who may be admitted to the collegiate department of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf from 125 to 145. I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, together with a letter from the Secretary of the Interior urging the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1180) to amend section 4865 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the number of beneficiaries from the several States and Territories authorized by section 4865 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for admission to the collegiate department of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf be, and it hereby is, increased from 125 to 145.

The accompanying letter is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 17, 1935.

The CHAIRMAN,
Committee on Education and Labor,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a copy of a proposed bill to amend section 4865 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, increasing the number of beneficiaries from the several States and Territories who may be admitted to the collegiate department of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

For the education of deaf mutes in the District of Columbia, the United States has established and maintains the Columbia Institution for the Deaf. The advance department, known as "Gallaudet College", accepts students from outside the District, most of whom are in poor circumstances and need the help of the scholarships offered by the institution. Although Congress has restricted the number of such beneficiaries, it has progressively expanded its authorization to provide for a steadily increasing demand for enrollment. Thus the original limit of 40 has been increased first to 60, then to 100, and finally, in the year 1918, to 125. The enrollment has again reached a point where authority to increase the number is necessary.

It is respectfully requested, therefore, that this bill be placed before the Senate for appropriate action.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

REGULATION OF TRAFFIC IN PETROLEUM

As in legislative session,

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a few days ago I introduced Senate bill 858 reenacting in effect section 9 (c) of the National Industrial Recovery Act relating to the transportation of oil. This was the section of that act held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in the Amazon and Panama cases. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] introduced a joint resolution somewhat similar. These measures have been before the Committee on Mines and Mining, and we have agreed upon the draft of a new bill in which are incorporated some of the suggestions contained in the measure of the Senator from Oklahoma. So I ask leave to reintroduce the measure at this time with that explanation and have it referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The bill (S. 1190) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products

produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

INCREASE OF CAPACITY OF THE PANAMA CANAL

As in legislative session,

Mr. GORE. I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals. Owing to the general interest in the subject matter, I should like to have the joint resolution printed in the RECORD. It is very brief.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 36) to authorize an investigation of the means of increasing capacity of the Panama Canal for future needs of interoceanic shipping, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Governor of the Panama Canal is hereby authorized and directed to investigate the means of increasing the capacity of the Panama Canal for future needs of interoceanic shipping, and to prepare designs and approximate estimates of cost of such additional locks or other structures and facilities as are needed for the purpose, and to make progress reports from time to time of the results thereof.

AMENDMENT TO AN APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION

As in legislative session,

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) making additional appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, the National Mediation Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the joint resolution insert the following:

For an additional amount for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of Public Act No. 125, Seventy-third Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a commission to establish the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia", approved March 21, 1934, including salaries, travel and subsistence expenses as authorized by law, to be immediately available, $4,000.

THE WORLD COURT

The Senate resumed the consideration of Executive A (71st Cong., 3d sess.), protocols concerning adherence of the United States to the Court of International Justice, the pending question being the amendment of Mr. VANDENBERG to the resolution of adherence, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, inasmuch as I propose to address myself exclusively to the pending reservation to the protocols of adherence to the World Court, I ask that the clerk read the pending amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved further, That adherence to the said protocols and statute hereby approved shall not be so construed as to require the United States to depart from its traditional policy of not intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political question of policy or internal administration of any foreign state; nor shall adherence to the said protocols and statute be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I am attracted by the amendment he has offered, and I recall what transpired in the Committee on Foreign Relations. May I ask the Senator what does he mean and what will he have it understood is meant by the words "shall not be construed"? Shall not be construed by whom?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the language which is contained in this reservation, as I shall subsequently indicate, is in the historical form which has followed down through the entire assertion of these rights by the Senate for many years. Whatever appropriate construction attaches to it attaches traditionally, and the Senator is quite as competent as am I to make the interpretation. Possibly as we proceed I can make plain what I have in my own mind.

Mr. President, the language read by the clerk speaks for itself; indeed, the language read by the clerk makes the only speech that should be necessary in defense of the proposed reservation. It is plain and simple language. It is an invincible recital. It is a statement of policy often asserted by the Senate heretofore, and never heretofore denied by the Senate upon any occasion when the Senate has been invited to announce it. The theory and meaning of the reservation are not denied by any of the proponent Senators who are most eagerly pressing our adherence to the World Court. In the face of such a situation I confess that it is something of a shock to me to find any resistance whatsoever to this reassertion of this historic policy. Indeed, when the Committee on Foreign Relations a few days ago rejected the amendment by the significantly close vote of 11 to 9 it was done without any discussion whatsoever, because, I take it, none of us contemplated that there would be any question raised against this regular procedure in behalf of the assertion of this regular, traditional, fundamental, and unchallenged American doctrine.

One of the outstanding advocates and earnestly zealous enthusiasts in the country in behalf of World Court adherence, one in whose judgment I have great confidence, was in contact with me upon this subject this morning, and I asked him what his verdict would be upon this reservation. This was his language in reply. He said, "It is an excess of caution, but it is harmless."

Mr. President, it is never an excess of caution for the American people, and the Senate speaking in their behalf, to reassert the traditional and fundamental policies which we have pursued in all our international relations for years.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. VANDENBERG. In just a moment. If all that can be said against it is that it is harmless, then I submit it should be accepted lest those of us who feel its deliberate rejection would be harmful can be satisfied in our opinion.

I yield now to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. A brief statement will be necessary in order to make clear my position in this matter, and I ask the attention of all Senators.

The domestic policies of the United States are not subject to the approval of foreign governments. It is a strange process of reasoning, in my judgment, that would prompt one who insists that domestic policies and traditional policies are solely matters for the consideration of this Government, to put the proponents of the doctrine in the position of depending on foreign governments to consent to that principle, or inviting them to reject that principle.

There is nothing in the pending resolution or any result that can come from it which detracts from, restricts, or impairs any domestic policy of the United States. When the issue is raised to submit to the 54 or more signatories to the World Court the question of whether in consenting to the World Court the United States reserves all questions pertaining to its domestic policies is a course which I cannot comprehend, if that course be pursued by one who believes in maintaining the domestic policies of the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will be patient, I think I can demonstrate to him very clear reasons why the Senate should again do precisely what it has done heretofore and what the Senator from Arkansas himself has heretofore supported under like circumstances.

Mr. ROBINSON. I shall be very patient. I shall not again interrupt the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I welcome the Senator's interruptions, because the thing we are all seeking is information.

When the Senator from Arkansas says it is a strange process of reasoning which would present a declaration of this character in connection with an engagement of this nature, I refer him back to his own support of precisely the same type

of statement upon at least two previous occasions, as I shall subsequently indicate.

Mr. President, I repeat that I do not rise to enter on a general discussion of the World Court question. There are many phases of it I should like to traverse. But time does not permit this afternoon, and I do not want to be diverted from my special purpose. I address myself exclusively to the pending reservation. I want to assert with the greatest respect but in the plainest possible language that I consider it to be a simple and conclusive test; that is, the vote upon this reservation will be a simple and conclusive test whether Senators are completely convinced that the protocols do not infringe upon the traditional and indispensable policies of the United States essential to our peace and our independence. It cannot change the actual contract one way or the other, but it can demonstrate our own understanding of the contract beyond further argument.

I am not conceiving an America which is cut off from voluntary cooperation in the promotion of the peace of the world. That always has been one of our high and persistent aspirations. This is a foreshortened world, and I shall clearly indicate before I shall have concluded that I have no prejudice against voluntary international cooperation on the part of the United States. But neither do I envision a United States capabe of making a useful contribution to peace, and the peace of the world in particular, except as it does preserve, without any question or shadow of a doubt whatsoever, its own inherent independent right to make up its own mind respecting these issues and its maintenance of its own traditional attitudes.

Mr. President, it is my contention, precisely as it is the contention of the Senator from Arkansas, that the protocols pending do not intend to infringe upon any of those rights which are recited in the pending reservation. This is the reason why I have been willing to sustain the protocols. It is equally the reason for my presentation of this reservation to confirm my belief in specific terms. But my belief in the conviction of like-minded Senators upon this floor will be shaken if, after listening to a simple statement of the facts involved, they shall reject a reservation which is nothing more than a reiterated assertion in specific terms of what proponent Senators claim to be the unimpaired American status. I confess to utter amazement that there should be any semblance of challenge to such standard.

I think perhaps a general statement ought to be made about my attitude toward the fundamental question so there may be no mistake about it. It is frequently asserted that no one is interested in a reservation to these protocols except as he is interested in defeating the fundamental issue itself. My record denies any such purpose so far as I am concerned, although I most certainly do not challenge the good faith of those who support reservations, regardless of whether they intend ultimately to attack the entire proposition. They certainly are logical in wanting every possible safeguard embraced. It seems to me that those who share my view of the pending contract are no less logical. It is one point where all minds should meet.

My record of 15 years publicly and privately is that I would not take America into the League of Nations under any circumstances whatsoever. That is my position today. I would not consciously approach one single inch of a step toward American membership in the League of Nations. That continues to be my position today. But I have argued all through this same period that it is possible to create an effective discrimination and distinction between the League of Nations and the World Court.

This is my conception of what is intended by the pending protocols. I want to make it very clear because I am one of those who voted to report these protocols in spite of my disappointment that the committee should reject this interpretative amendment which is wholly in harmony with this viewpoint. I want to make it perfectly plain that in my judgment under the program of proposed adherence we are left wholly free to decide for ourselves in each individual instance whether we choose to enter the Court as plaintiff or defendant or as litigant in any capacity whatsoever; that we are wholly free from the menace of any advisory opinions by the Court over our objections whenever we have or claim an interest; that we are bound only if, as, and when we choose to be bound; that these are the literal conditions in the instrument itself; that these are the explicit interpretations of those who sponsor and promote this legislation; that we therefore hazard no foreign entanglement and no surrender of traditional American positions and attitudes.

If I am right, I argue that all Senators, whether favorable to Court membership or not, should be eager to identify those landmarks beyond all possible misunderstanding or subsequent dispute. If it be what has been termed an "excess of caution", it is none the less advisable. If it be reiteration, nothing is lost. On the other hand, if I am mistaken in my opinion of the letter of the bond—and I have the greatest respect for the fears upon this score expressed by opponents to any Court adherence whatever—then much is gained for all of us, and for the country, by an explicit identification of the thing we think we do. I can at least identify the thing I think I am doing by offering and by sustaining this reservation.

I want to say again that I draw a sharp distinction, as I have for 15 years, between the Court and the League. I concede that if we were to be taken into the Court without adequate protection for our fundamental rights the discrimination could not be preserved; but I think it is possible to preserve these rights and I think the intent of the pending protocols is to preserve them. I take this position with respect to that, with a reiteration that I would not consciously approach one single inch toward membership in the League of Nations. I agree with the statement upon that subject made by President Roosevelt in 1932—not the statements he made in 1920 but the statement he made in 1932, when he said:

> American participation in the League would not serve the highest purposes of the prevention of war and the settlement of international difficulties in accordance with fundamental American ideas. Because of these facts, therefore, I do not favor American participation.

In that same address, which was before the New York State Grange, President Roosevelt was advocating a trade conference with the other nations of the world. He further said:

> Such a conference should not by any stretch of the imagination involve the United States in any participation in political controversies in Europe or elsewhere. Nor does it involve the renewal in any way of the problem 12 years ago of American participation as a member of the League of Nations.

That is the spirit in which it should be possible for us to give our limited adherence to the World Court. At any rate, it is my conception of the thing we are asked to do. Certainly the expressions in the pending reservation are but a paraphrase of the President himself as he spoke upon this other occasion.

So I assert again that I want, if possible, to clinch the discrimination between the Court and the implications of the League. Those who are like-minded, Mr. President, certainly cannot logically vote to reject the pending amendment, which does nothing except to reassert the fundamental American attitude and the fundamental American policy, which has been similarly asserted upon every other occasion, when either the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate or the Senate itself has ever heretofore acted upon this question.

I beg of Senators to think of this open-mindedly, because there is a reality to the advisability of this declaration. If the declaration never had been made heretofore in these connections, the situation might be different; but, since it has been made heretofore, the affirmative refusal to repeat the declaration today too easily invites what I believe to be the false implication that there is a change in the status from the status upon these other occasions.

The important thing about this reservation is its history, Mr. President. I am not speaking of the history of the idea behind it, because the history of the idea behind it would be a survey covering every hour of the American story from the neutrality proclamation of 1793 down to date. It would start with Washington and Hamilton and Jefferson, and,

with few detours, it would be the continuous story of dominant, priceless, and indispensable American tradition.

Senators know the history of the idea. It is impregnated in the very air we breathe. I beg of them to be equally attentive to the history of this specific reservation and the language of it, because therein lies the challenge to our reiteration of this reservation, and therein lies the possible danger of an unfortunate implication if it be not reasserted.

What is the history of this precise pending reservation?

Mr. President, in the first place, this precise language originally appeared as the fourth paragraph of the fifth reservation to the resolution of World Court adherence in 1926. Let us not have any misunderstanding about this identification of it. The able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] a few days ago said that this particular resolution—I mean the original of 1926—was not a part of the fifth reservation. I think he made that categorical statement. So far as the record of the Senate is concerned, I think the facts dispute his conclusions, because, as I indicated at the time, the Executive Journal of the Senate itself, volume 64, part I, pages 541 and 542, describes this precise original reservation as "the fourth and last paragraph of reservation no. 5."

Mr. President, so far as the official record of the Senate is concerned, it still is the fourth and last paragraph of reservation no. 5. It is still the fourth and last paragraph of reservation no. 5, because there is no denouncement of it in the pending protocol of accession—exhibit C in the pending Senate document.

Since there is no denouncement of it in the protocol of accession, and since that protocol reads that:

> The States signatories * * * have mutually agreed * * * subject to the five reservations formulated by the United States in the resolution adopted by the Senate on January 27, 1926—

and then that "The States signatories * * * accept" the reservations, subject only to the conditions that follow, and since there are no conditions that follow which refer directly or indirectly to this particular reservation, it would seem to stand today as included specifically within the contract to which we are invited to adhere. That could be a conclusive reason for my belief that we are inherently protected, among other reasons. Still, it would not be a reason for abandoning reiteration, because the Senator from Arkansas says it is not in the contracts; that the language was not part of the original fifth reservation. I think his word was "ambiguity" as he spoke of one other apparent disagreement between text and resolution. Certainly there is an ambiguity here. Indeed there is a direct clash. There is a direct dispute between the record and the Senator from Arkansas in this connection; and if there were no other reason than that alone, since this relates to a fundamental policy and a fundamental American right we should make perfectly certain that we say what we mean, so that he who runs may read.

Mark you, we are now at the birth of the language of this specific reservation. It is my reservation only by adoption. It was written by former Senator Swanson, of Virginia, who now sits in the President's Cabinet at the head of the naval portfolio. If there was need of it in 1926—and apparently the then Senator from Virginia thought there was need for it—there certainly is emphasized need for it today. At any rate, we are tracing the history because the history is significant in respect to the challenge which is laid to the conscience of Senators as they pass upon this reservation ultimately.

We find, I repeat, in the first place, that it was born—and I remind you again that this is the literal, verbatim language, without the change of a comma, which was offered by the Senator from Virginia at that time—we find this precise reservation, then, born in 1926 under the auspices of the distinguished Senator from Virginia. Evidently he saw no such impropriety in it as is now charged to its lineal descendant.

Secondly, when the Senate acted upon the entire body of the reservations in 1926, and upon the fifth reservation in particular, it acted paragraph by paragraph. There is no mistaking the record in this respect. Although other paragraphs and other parts of the fifth reservation were debated at great length and were the subjects of heated divisions and frequent roll calls, this particular paragraph was accepted by acclamation. The Senate Journal does not disclose a single voice or vote against it. Apparently it never occurred to anybody then that there could be any reason against it, or that there was any novelty or strange process of reasoning attached to its promulgation. There is none now unless our prospective status has basically changed, which I deny, and which the sponsors of ratification at least vocally deny.

So, now, let us remember that we are tracing the story of the precise reservation which now rests upon the bar of the Senate. We find first that it was written by the then Democratic Senator from Virginia, Mr. Swanson. We find, secondly, that it was unanimously adopted, all by itself, by the Senate of that day in connection with the voting upon our limited adhesion to the World Court. Next, after it had been voted into the resolution of ratification, which was on January 26, 1926, the Senate finally passed upon the whole contract as it then impended, and it did so by roll call. In that contract which the Senate then approved was the precise reservation now resting upon the bar of the Senate. It was adopted by a vote of 76 to 17. Manifestly, all of the 17 approved the reservation, because the reason of their objection to the completed contract was that it did not adequately protect the thing which this reservation asserts.

Who were among the other 76, Mr. President, who then voted affirmatively upon this proposition, and validated not only the specific language now pending as an amendment but validated its attachment to our proposal to adhere to the World Court? I call the roll simply to indicate the extent of the credentials which the pending amendment has.

The following Senators who are still Members of this body voted that day in favor of the thing which is now pending:

Senators Ashurst, Capper, Copeland, Couzens, Fletcher, George, Gerry, Glass, Hale, Harrison, Keyes, McKellar, McNary, Metcalf, Neely, Norbeck, Norris, Pittman (the present Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee), Robinson, of Arkansas (the distinguished leader upon the other side and the sponsor of the pending resolution of adherence), Trammell, Walsh, the late Senator from Montana, whom the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] justly eulogized the other day for his faithfulness in this and every other cause, and Wheeler.

Thus, the language of the pending reservation was imbedded in the Senate's official mandate in 1926. Now, remember, we are following the story of this thing which we are now asked to reject upon the one hand, but which I am asserting to you every force of logic and prudence and every challenge of the record calls upon us to reintroduce into our resolution of adherence.

What happened next? We find that this thing was the language of the then Senator from Virginia. We find that it was unanimously approved by itself by the Senate of the United States. We find then that, imbedded in the resolution of adherence, it was eloquently approved upon roll call, as I have indicated. What is the next entry on the record?

After the failure of international agreement upon the action of the Senate in 1926, the World Court issue next arose officially in 1932. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee again acted. It again voted to recommend an American formula of adherence, this time under the primary leadership of the late Senator Walsh, of Montana. This was after the so-called "Root formula" was in being. It was precisely the same situation in all its aspects which the Senate confronts today in respect to the form of the pending resolution.

There was no difference in the status then and now. What happened when it was proposed in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in May 1932 to attach this precise amendment to our resolution of adherence? Why, Mr. President, it was unanimously accepted. It never occurred to anybody that there was any question to be raised against it. The late Senator from Montana, Mr. Walsh,

was particularly willing, as I recall, because of my conversations with him, to have this affirmative statement made in respect to the thing which we think we are about to do. He was more than willing to make assurance doubly sure.

Members of the Senate still sitting in this body who will again pass upon this precise amendment, who voted that day to attach it to the resolution of adherence, are the following:

Senators BORAH, JOHNSON, CAPPER, LA FOLLETTE, VANDENBERG, PITTMAN, the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, ROBINSON, of Arkansas, HARRISON, GEORGE, BLACK, WAGNER, CONNALLY, and LEWIS.

This happened on June 1, 1932. What in the interim has changed the situation so that it now ceases to be proper to do that which at that time everybody agreed was proper?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. I am sure the able Senator from Michigan would not leave the intimation that I had approved the World Court in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I am asserting that the Senator was happy to approve this particular reservation then, as he did this week. He agrees with me upon the reservation, but not upon the ultimate objective.

Mr. LEWIS. I do not recall the previous vote. I do not recall any vote whatever, but I only wish it to be clear that I have never approved adherence to the World Court when voted on in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I want the record perfectly clear that that was not my assertion. I stated only that the able Senator twice approved the pending reservation when it was then submitted; and that is the record.

Now comes an interesting thing in this chronology: I ask you to remember that this was June 1, 1932, when the late Senator from Montana, Mr. Walsh, and the former Senator from Ohio, Mr. Fess, reported the World Court resolution to the Senate with appending reservations, one of which was the amendment which I again offer. Mark you, this was June 1, 1932, when the World Court resolution was reported to the Senate with this resolution appending. Twenty-six days later the Democratic National Convention met in Chicago, and it was under the chairmanship of the late Senator from Montana, Mr. Walsh. In that convention at Chicago, 26 days later, what was it that the Democratic National platform had to say about the World Court? The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] already has read it, but he did not linger upon the ultimate and controlling phrase in it. This is what the convention said in its platform:

> We advocate * * * adherence to the World Court with appending reservations.

Mr. President, what reservations were appending at that time except those that were reported on June 1, 1932, by the very distinguished Democrat who presided over the convention in Chicago which made this assertion? Can there be any denial that the reference embraces the appending reservations of June 1, only 26 days previous?

What were the appending reservations which the majority party, now so substantially in control of the decisions that are made in this body, thus approved? What was the obligation which was written into their platform in respect to this thing?

> We advocate * * * adherence to the World Court with appending reservations.

There can be no doubt of the obvious answer. And one of the appending reservations, Mr. President, beyond any chance of controversy, was the precise reservation which they now have a chance again to adopt in keeping with their promise. If there is any doubt, furthermore, about the fact that they particularly meant this pending reservation, I call attention to the further language in their platform, which, in its discussion of foreign relations, said:

> We advocate * * * no interference in the internal affairs of other nations.

Mr. President, that is nothing more nor less than a short but accurate paraphrase of the very reservation which now invites the Senate's action and which beckons these gentlemen to validate the promise that they made to the country in this aspect in 1932. Their promise was to adhere to the World Court with appending reservations. That was on June 27, 1932. The only appending reservations to which it could possibly refer are the appending reservations which 26 days previously had been offered upon this floor by the distinguished Democratic Senator who presided over the convention as its chairman. I am sure, upon reflection, they will keep faith.

It does not make much difference what the Republican platform commitment was, unfortunately, in the purview of our roll-call mathematics. Nevertheless, for the purpose of the record—and we are counting the chronology to see what it is that leads us, as I see it, irresistibly to again approve the appending reservation—what did the Republican convention say? After a specific endorsement of the World Court, it said:

> The party will continue to maintain its attitude of * * * going forward in harmony with other peoples without alliances or foreign partnerships.

That was the platform of my party, and my entire World Court attitude is in harmony with it and with the recommendations which my party's President have submitted to the Senate upon this score. The pending reservation is but the lengthened shadow of this quoted phrase, even as it mirrors the presumable purport of the pending protocols themselves.

Against this historical background which approves the pending reservation in spirit, if not actually by letter upon every occasion and upon every test, we now come down to 1935, at this good hour, and what happens now? Mr. President, the next appearance of this precise language, without the change of a comma—the next appearance of this precise language is in the Foreign Relations Committee on January 9, 1935, when, without a word of explanation or debate and solely upon the suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the committee, to my amazement, voted 11 to 9 to decline to do that which the Senate itself had done upon every previous occasion when invited, and that which the committee itself had been willing to do—glad to do—upon a previous occasion.

So finally in the chronology the reservation now comes to the Senate itself, and it is this thing of which I am speaking, and it is this challenge that I am laying to the attention of the Senate. The Senate is asked once more to do precisely the same thing that it has always done without any deviation whatsoever upon every other occasion in connection with this contemplation.

Why, why is the situation so different today, I beg to ask? What are the conditions that are different today than they were in 1932 when Senators Walsh and Fess reported this same reservation upon the Root formula itself? What is the difference between the situation in which we find ourselves today and the situation in which the Foreign Relations Committee found itself in May 1932? There is no difference whatsoever. Therefore in the natural course of events the normal thing to have expected in the Foreign Relations Committee was that the unanimous experience that we have had with this reservation heretofore would again occur. But it did not. And so we find ourselves in the amazing situation, Mr. President, that this assertion of fundamental American purpose and principle which heretofore always has been affirmatively announced—we find ourselves in the amazing position—confronting a situation in which it is affirmatively rejected. It is this act of rejection which lends chief emphasis to my anxiety to reassert the doctrine involved, lest the rejection some day may invite an interpretation which I am sure was not intended by the Senators themselves.

I confess I am unable to conjure the reasons which could justify rejection. Have we shifted our position? Someone might say so, according to the record in the Foreign Relations Committee. Yet it is my view that we have not shifted our

base at all. But if we have not shifted our base, why should not we readily again reassert the thing that has always been asserted heretofore without any thought of a rejection? Is there anything contradictory, Mr. President, in this pending reservation and in the body and purport of the protocols themselves? The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] says there is nothing inconsistent. That is my view. It is my view that we merely invite the Senate to say in terms what the proponents of the pending protocols assert in generality to be the American status in respect to the particular things here under discussion.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I understand the Senator from Michigan to say, as a matter of fact, that there is no necessity for this resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No, Mr. President; the contrary, because of collateral implications.

Mr. BORAH. I understood the Senator to say that this protocol and our adherence to the Court under the protocol would not be a sacrifice of the traditional policies of the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is my view. But I assert the corollary to it, that since in addition to that inherent fact it has been thought advisable heretofore to make an affirmative assertion on the subject—wisdom in which I cordially concur—there is a most unfortunate implication raised when there is an affirmative rejection of the same sort of a statement today. That is the chief measure of real necessity, in my view. I can think of no reason whatsoever in logic why it should be rejected unless it is contradictory, and I have yet to hear a proponent Senator testify that it is contradictory. If it is contradictory, let us have the direct testimony, because there ought to be candor in international relations or there certainly never will be peace. And if there is to be candor, and if there is to be clarity, where is the objection to an assertion as contained in the pending reservation—an assertion of the precise thing which we mean? What is the objection to saying what it is that is in our hearts and souls?

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BULKLEY. Does the Senator think that if this reservation should be adopted by the Senate it would necessitate the whole agreement's going back to all the signatory powers for specific acceptance?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, so far as my view is concerned, I should say not, because this is a statement of our understanding of what we mean when we sign up, and how long has it been since we could not say for ourselves what we think we are doing when we are doing it?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. In connection with the question asked by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY], is it not true that if the reservation as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations is adopted by the Senate it must still go back to conference, and there still must be a further or a newer protocol of accession?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator is opening a new phase of the discussion, which I prefer not to enter, because I wish to concentrate upon the thing which is before the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. My question was only suggested by reason of the inquiry of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I assume the able Senator from Maine is about to discuss the change of language in another section of the contract, and I do not want to be diverted into that field. I will say this to the Senator from Ohio, also, that if there is any question of consent involved, I call his attention to the fact that this precise pending reservation defined in the Journal of the Senate as the fourth and last paragraph of reservation no. 5, as the able Senator from Ohio well knows, because he studied it with me as he sat here the other day, is already accepted by other signatories under the protocol of accession, so far as the record is concerned. And why in the name of common sense, after on the face of the record it has been accepted abroad, we should hesitate to reassert it at home certainly challenges the human imagination.

Mr. BULKLEY. I should think that if it had been accepted it would no more need reassertion than any other matter.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree, Mr. President; but one trouble is, there is a disagreement as to whether it has been accepted, because the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] insists it is not part of reservation no. 5. Now, you can take either horn of the dilemma you want. If it is duplication, there is no harm done; if it is not duplication, most certainly the Senator from Ohio wants to reassert it precisely as I do. So why not give ourselves the benefit of the doubt instead of somebody else?

The President of the United States in his message to the Senate upon the subject of World Court adherence describes what he hopes will happen in connection with adherence. What is the only bill of particulars submitted by the President of the United States himself in respect to what he hopes the Senate will do in respect to this pending question? This is all he has to say:

> I urge that the Senate's consent be given in such form as not to defeat or to delay the objective of adherence.

Mr. President, there is nothing in this pending reservation which could either delay or defeat the objective of adherence. On the contrary, the acceptance of this reservation might well hasten final action and might actually improve the chances to do precisely what the President expressed his hope may be done.

So there is no proscription under which this reservation can possibly fall. There is every reason why this thing should be done. There is no reason whatsoever why it should not be done.

I venture to believe that few Senators would say in stated terms, if the situation were reversed—and sometimes it is a good thing to assess a proposition in reverse—I assert that no proponent Senator would affirmatively say that this pending adherence requires the United States to intrude upon, interfere with, and entangle itself in the political questions of policy and of internal administration of some 50 foreign states, and that it involves a relinquishment by the United States of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions.

If you are unwilling to make the affirmative assertion that we do relinquish and that we do surrender, why are you not willing, in the alternative, to make the affirmative assertion that we do not surrender and we do not relinquish?

I ask the Senate again constantly to bear in mind that the controlling importance of the situation is that always heretofore the Senate and the Foreign Relations Committee, without even a division, have made this assertion and attached this amendment to the protocols, and if there be an affirmative rejection today it specifically invites an implication which no man upon this floor would care voluntarily to approve.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that the situation clearly calls for the adoption of this reservation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEIWER in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LONG. I am very much interested in the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the resolution of adherence. The last clause of the proposed amendment reads:

> Nor shall adherence to the said protocols and statute be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions.

I wonder if the Senator would object to my putting a little amendment in there to the effect that it is intended that America does not relinquish its traditional attitude under the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will be good enough to offer his amendment independently, I

would prefer that course to be followed, for the reason I fear the Senator has not been here during the last few minutes—that I am offering language which is verbatim, without the change of a comma, the precise historical form by which the Senate has always spoken upon similar occasions in respect to problems of this nature. The Monroe Doctrine unquestionably is included. I do not want anybody to have any reason, not even the reason of a misplaced comma, to say that the situation, being different in any aspect, justifies opposition.

Mr. LONG. Then I will not urge my suggestion; but, if the Senator will pardon me for making one more observation along that line, that was before England and France found out that they could do what they pleased around here.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, Mr. President, the more rapid the disclosures of the nature to which the Senator refers the greater the desirability for reiterating the declaration which I am urging.

It is not enough to say that the declaration in the proposed reservation is surplusage. It is never surplusage to declare our historic position upon any and every occasion. It will not do to say it is needless. It is never needless to reassert this position. Though it be ten thousand times a twice-told tale, let us never weary of repeating and reiterating this saving philosophy of the Republic.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I have a desire to make a few remarks on the question now pending before the Senate, not that I believe I can add anything to what is already known but for the reason that I should like to make a matter of record my own opinion about this question.

I have listened with a very great deal of interest to the speeches which have been made. It seemed to me that when the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] had completed his speech we should have known exactly what was pending before the Senate at this time. He clearly pointed out the very narrow question that we were to consider. Since that time the debate has taken a wide range, and I am very much persuaded that fully 90 percent, if not more than that, of all that has been said has been entirely foreign to the question before us.

I listened day before yesterday to that great statesman—and I say it with the utmost sincerity—the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

He is always eloquent, nearly always logical, and what he says is based upon fact. I have always had a great admiration for him. Long before I knew him I thought he was one of the great statesmen of America, and I still think so; and so I listened to his speech with very great attention; but after he had concluded his speech, I was absolutely convinced that nothing could be said that would have very much weight against our becoming a member of the World Court or rather our adhering under the resolution to the three protocols now before us. I have analyzed the speech of the Senator from California since and I believe that I can see, and I believe that I could convince him, that there is not a single valid argument that he advances against affirmative action on the part of the Senate.

I noticed his reference to his grandson, 21 years of age. I have only one grandson, who is about 8 or 9 months old, in whom I am as much interested as is the Senator from California in his grandson. I think that some day when the grandson of the Senator from California is rather glorying in the fact that he had a famous grandfather and while he is reading the statesmanlike papers and speeches of his grandfather, perhaps he will come down to the speech the Senator made the other day, and he will say, in good old Kentucky language, to the others gathered around him, who are also proud of their grandfathers, "What was the matter with grandpap when he made that speech, because there is not very much in it?"

I think the Senator from California, as well as some of the other distinguished Senators, are very much like the old farmer who swore that his horse was 16 feet high when he meant 16 hands high, and, having once sworn it, stuck to it. I really cannot see any argument in what has so far been advanced against our adherence to the protocols. It is true the Senator from California said that he was a sort of "John the Baptist", and that a greater than he would come along to discuss this question. I do not know exactly whom he meant, but I have a suspicion, and I shall listen to the argument of that "greater one" with the same attention that I gave to the arguments which have already been made, hoping that perhaps there may be some sound argument advanced against adherence to the pending World Court protocols.

I know that this question is of considerable importance, and we talk about it as if it were the most important thing in the world; but I assert, and I think truly, that after we shall have ratified these protocols, within 6 weeks thereafter 99 percent of the people of America will not know whether we are a member of the Court or whether we are not, and in just a little while we ourselves will perhaps have to look the matter up in some encyclopedia to find out whether we are a member; but the work will go on.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LOGAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. What the Senator from Kentucky has stated is just the trouble. About the time people begin to have their rights adjudicated by the World Court, they will not even know where the decisions are coming from.

Mr. LOGAN. I think they always will know; I think the Court will perform its functions; and here it may not be amiss for us to consider just for a few moments the character of work the Court has done. There has been a good deal of talk about its not bringing peace. The Senator from California has rather held it up as a monstrous thing, stating that this Court is an evil thing that is likely to bring all kinds of trouble to the world. I believe, therefore, that it is necessary for us for a few moments to consider some of the questions that have been before the Court and what the Court has done about them. If we will do that, I think we will all have a better understanding of what we are trying to do at this time.

The Senator from California said it was the League of Nations Court. Oh, no, I might say, although I would not say it of the Senator from California, that that suggestion has been spread abroad as propaganda. We had as well say that the Constitution of the United States is a Magna Carta constitution, that it is an English constitution, because our ideas came from Magna Carta, or the Charter of Rights, as to say that the World Court is a League of Nations court. That is a misnomer. It is what it purports to be, a court entirely separate from the League, so far as we are concerned, for the purpose of determining international disputes in a legal way, in an effort to prevent the necessity of the resort to armed conflict in order to settle questions that should be settled by a court.

I think we had just as well admit that this Nation must do one of two things: It must either take part in world affairs in an effort to bring about the betterment of the human race throughout the world, it must discharge its duties as a great nation and must cooperate with other nations, or else it must do that which some of our great Senators think it should do, withdraw entirely from the world, saying that it is economically self-sufficient and able to exist without regard to any other nation and that it will become completely isolated from the world so far as public affairs are concerned. If we take that position, an extreme nationalist position, it will become necessary for us to build the largest navy in the world so that we may protect ourselves against the aggressions of other nations; it will become necessary for us to have the largest army in the world. If we are going to say good-bye to all the world, and have nothing to do with the rest of the world, then we must place ourselves in a position to defend our Nation against all others.

I believe that the United States of America should retain her nationalistic spirit. There is no one, I believe, who is

more patriotic than myself, but at the same time the United States of America has no right to say, "I am too big to be subjected to law; I am unwilling to allow any of the controversies that may arise between me and some other nation to be submitted to a court; I insist that I will not be subjected to any legal rule or to international law." It would be just as well, so it seems to me, for some man, rich and powerful in his community, to say, "I will not submit any controversy that I have with my neighbor to a court"; it would be just as well for a capitalist to say, "I am not going to submit any controversy that I have to a court, because perchance the court is made up of laboring men." It would be just as well for a member of the colored population of this Nation of ours, more than 10,000,000 of them, to say, "I do not intend to allow any dispute that I have with another race to be submitted to the court because my people are not represented on the court." I believe—and I am very sincere in that belief—that our becoming a member of the World Court will accomplish much good.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the Court will accomplish all the things that those who are most partial to it believe it will accomplish; I do not think it will solve all the problems of the world; I do not believe that all controversies will be submitted to the Court and settled by it; but I do believe that, although it may not be a very long step, our entry into the Court will be a step in the right direction.

Now, let us examine briefly, because I have no desire to take the time of the Senate unduly, some of the opinions that have been rendered by this Court so that we may ascertain the nature of the questions that have been considered and see whether they are worthwhile or whether they are not.

The very first judgment that was rendered by that Court was in the case of a French steamship. It will be recalled that the steamship *Wimbledon* wanted to go through the Kiel Canal for the purpose of delivering some munitions of war to Poland, Poland being at war at that time with Russia. Germany said the ship could not go through the Kiel Canal; that it would be an interference with the internal rights of Germany if the vessel should be allowed to go through the canal. But Germany had agreed in a treaty, which it had approved, that the ships of all nations at peace with Germany should on equal terms be allowed to pass through the Kiel Canal.

When the German Government refused to allow this vessel to go through the Kiel Canal, all the interested parties—France, England, Japan, and some other nations which were interested in the question—filed suit against Germany. They filed with the registrar at The Hague a statement of the cause of action and brought Germany into court. The Court determined that Germany was violating the terms of the treaty, which guaranteed that all nations should have equal access to the Kiel Canal if they were not at war with Germany. The case was before the Court for some time. Different phases of it were presented to the Court. It was held that France, the owner of the vessel, was entitled to recover for the damage which may have been sustained. That was just an ordinary controversy which arose between France on the one side and Germany on the other. If they had not had a court to which the matter could have been submitted, perhaps it would have been settled through some form of war.

There is another case I should like to mention. There have been many, but I want to mention just one more. I refer to the case of a Greek subject, Mavrommatis, who lived in Jerusalem. He had a concession to furnish electric light and power and drinking water, which had been granted by the Turkish Government before Palestine was mandated to England. The contract was not carried out. The same rights were perhaps granted to someone else—a British subject, I believe—with the result that through his Government Mavrommatis filed a suit before the World Court. Greece came into court and said it had the right to bring the suit against England because of the fact that the contractor, Mavrommatis, was a Greek subject and Greece had the right, acting for one of its nationals, to bring the suit, because thus Greece became really the party in interest.

The World Court deals only with controversies between or among the nations and not between or among individuals. The Court sustained the contention of Greece and held that the suit might be maintained in favor of Greece as against England. The case went to trial and it was held by the Court that the Greek subject had the legal concession to furnish light and power and water in Jerusalem. The matter was before the Court in one form and another a number of times, and, while it was held that he had that right, I believe the Court decided he was not entitled to any damages, but that England should restore to him the same right which had been taken away.

The opinions which I have mentioned are only two of many where controversies have arisen between nations that have gone into the Court to determine the rights involved. I suppose those who oppose ratification of the treaty feel that it would be better perhaps if we sent our battleships into some foreign port and there terrorized some little nation and forced it in some way to pay a judgment or claim instead of submitting the matter to the Court in a perfectly legal way.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LOGAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator is one of the Senators favorable to a reciprocal tariff?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes; I am.

Mr. LONG. Did the Senator look up the case where the World Court passed upon a reciprocal tariff between Austria and Germany? I have not read it myself.

Mr. LOGAN. Knowing that the Senator from Louisiana is in great need of information, not only about this matter but about a good many other matters, I will read that opinion to him. [Laughter.] I am very glad he asked about it.

Mr. LONG. The Senator had better read the entire book he has in his hand, if that is the reason why he is reading.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield at that point?

Mr. LOGAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KING. I might add that the matter went a little further than indicated by the Senator from Louisiana. It was not merely a question of customs duties, but some persons believe it involved, directly or indirectly or remotely, the protection of Austria against economic and political assaults by Germany.

Mr. LONG. Any other tariff decision would involve that question.

Mr. KING. Oh no!

Mr. LOGAN. This decision was simply the construing of certain protocols or certain contracts, as it were, which had been entered into, certain agreements which had been made. The question was whether Austria-Hungary could enter into the arrangement with Germany without surrendering rights which destroyed or tended to destroy the very existence of Austria as a nation. Let us see what the opinion was. The opinion was requested by the Council of the League of Nations on May 19, 1931. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] referred to this matter the other day as a living example of what is liable to happen to us if we should become a member of the World Court. The question put to the Court was:

> Would a regime established between Germany and Austria on the basis and within the limits of the principles laid down in the protocol of March 19, 1931, the text of which is annexed to the present request, be compatible with article 88 of the Treaty of Saint-Germain and with protocol no. I signed at Geneva on October 4, 1922?

The nations which were attacking the arrangements which had been made between Austria and Germany simply took that customs agreement, filed it with the World Court, and said, "We put to you this question." This action called for an advisory opinion. The League of Nations referred it to the Court and said, "Does this agreement violate the two protocols which are mentioned?" What was the answer?

There were 15 members of the Court. They had different ideas about it. Finally eight of them reached an agree-

ment, it being an 8 to 7 decision, that it did violate the sovereignty of Austria, that she would be surrendering part of her sovereignty if it were carried out. The other seven said it would not be violative of the sovereignty of Austria. Our own member of the Court, Mr. Kellogg, voted with the minority in that case. I cannot see why anyone should make the contention that this is a political court simply because the Court has been called upon to consider treaties.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. LOGAN. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator from Kentucky know the nationality of the various judges who composed the majority and minority?

Mr. LOGAN. I believe I have the information.

Mr. LONG. I can tell the Senator who they are without reading them. England and France voted for the majority opinion.

Mr. LOGAN. That is only two. England and France voted for the majority opinion. There is no question about that, I believe. They all wrote separate opinions, and it is a little difficult to tell exactly how they did stand. The one I remember who really decided the case was the Italian member of the Court, Anzilotti, whose opinion was controlling.

Mr. LONG. He voted with the majority.

Mr. LOGAN. He was on both sides of the case. He reminds me somewhat of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in his politics in these days. [Laughter.] He took a neutral ground. I believe the book I have before me does not state the names of the judges, but I think France, England, Italy, perhaps Poland, and others I do not recall, voted with the majority. It was a close decision at all events.

Mr. LONG. Will my friend yield further?

Mr. LOGAN. Very well.

Mr. LONG. I had not looked to see what the vote was. I just know politics that well that I can tell the Senator now how they voted, and if I make a mistake I would almost be willing to say I am making a very serious blunder. Without looking to see who voted which way on the decision, all I know about it is that the Senator will find that England, France, Italy, Poland, most likely Russia——

Mr. KING. Russia was not a member of the Court.

Mr. LONG. Very well; Poland, Italy, and Czechoslovakia all voted with the majority. Why? Because they did not want the reciprocal agreement by which Germany would have the inside track on that trade. If we enter into a reciprocal trade agreement today with Cuba, the Court would have exactly the same jurisdiction over the United States and we would have exactly the same question before them.

Suppose we had an agreement with the Philippines. We have turned them loose and let them go. Immediately it would be said by Japan, "These trade agreements you have established are contrary to what is covered by various treaties." Therefore Japan would vote the other way. England has a trade agreement with Japan and she would vote the other way. It would be found that the United States would be trimmed 9 times out of 10 on the same basis.

It is an interesting fact that these minds, supposed to be judicial minds from England, France, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and these other countries, should all be of the same character. They vote just as the premiers in those countries would have voted in those cases. The judges are no different from any other politician who might be sitting on the Court.

Mr. LOGAN. May I say to the Senator from Louisiana that I am afraid he is not very well acquainted with politics, except Louisiana politics [laughter], and all of us admit he does know the situation down there. I might also suggest to him that the same argument he and others make against the World Court has been made against the Supreme Court of the United States from time to time. Back in the old slavery days it was said if a judge was from the South he voted for slavery and if he was from the North he voted against it. The same argument advanced by those who say the World Court is not fair has been advanced against every court that has ever existed in the world. There is really no more basis for the argument against the World Court than there has been in the past for the argument against other courts that have been set up to substitute the judgment of the court for individual judgment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOGAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. The Senator might with propriety allude to the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States upon a number of occasions has rendered what many people believed to be political judgments. We recall that it was alleged that Mr. Lincoln made appointments to the Court for the purpose of sustaining his greenback policy, because the Court had held that the act providing for the issue of greenbacks was unconstitutional. I do not say that was a political judgment or a political court. It has been claimed by some that not only the Supreme Court of the United States but State tribunals have rendered political decisions. Senators will recall that when provision was made to decide the question of who was elected President of the United States and an eminent judge of the Supreme Court, Judge Davis, of Illinois, was chosen to preside over the commission, it was openly and secretly charged that a political judgment was rendered that gave the Presidency to the Republicans, and denied it to the one who many believed was duly elected by the people of the United States.

So, Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky will understand and the Senator from Louisiana ought to understand that even in this Republic we are not free from the charge of having political courts and political judgments; but, taking it by and large, the Supreme Court of the United States from the beginning has represented the highest judicial thought and the highest form of morality, and our State courts, by and large, have risen to the responsibilities which rested upon them in their decisions.

Mr. LOGAN. I thank the Senator for the splendid statement he has made, better than I could have made it.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further on that point?

Mr. LOGAN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. POPE. I call attention to a statement made by Senator Hamlin with reference to the Dred Scott decision. Immediately after it was rendered, Senator Hamlin made a statement on the floor of the Senate in which he said that the Court, referring to the Supreme Court of the United States, "was swayed by political reasons, forgot the rights of Dred Scott, and plunged into this political whirlpool in order to control its currents." At the same time Senator Seward charged, to quote his exact language, that the decision "was the result of a political bargain between the Court and the President."

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I am not willing to say that courts are perfect. I am not willing to say that courts never make mistakes. I do say, however, that resort to the courts is the best method that has ever been found to settle disputes between or among individuals. It is the best plan that has ever been devised to settle controversies. If there were no courts, then, to use the old expression, everything would be settled on—

> The simple plan,
> That they should take who have the power
> And they should keep who can.

If the courts have been found the best instruments that we have to settle disagreements among individuals and groups of individuals, I do not believe there is a man or a woman throughout the United States who would be willing to say that we should not try to establish a court where law may be substituted for war; and to deny that it is proper for us to make that effort is to say that we are unwilling to submit our rights to a tribunal where the questions may be determined according to legal principles.

When the United States, a good many years ago, determined to withdraw itself from the world, I think it stabbed

very near the heart of the goddess of civilization herself. I do not believe the world can go on unless we can find some way in which questions may be decided according to legal principles rather than settled by the sword.

I noted day before yesterday, when the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] was making his speech, that he said we were departing from the tradition of the United States; that for more than a hundred years we had never refused to arbitrate any dispute arising with another nation. I call attention of that distinguished Senator to the fact that we have done nothing and will do nothing, if this court shall be set up, to prevent arbitration of such questions. Specifically, the right is retained. The Court of Arbitration at The Hague which has been in existence for many years still exists, and any nation has a perfect right to arbitrate its questions rather than to go into court. I also call attention, however, to the fact that nearly every State in the Union, so far as I know, has a method of procedure whereby controversies are determined between man and man by means of arbitration; and every court likewise has, as some of the distinguished judges know, a provision that these controversies, private as they are, may be submitted to arbitrators.

How many of you who have practiced law throughout the years have ever submitted a case to arbitration? Once in a while you have done so, but ninety-nine times out of a hundred the courts have been called upon to determine these questions. The courts have decided them, and arbitration has almost fallen into disuse. The only reason why this Nation uses arbitration now is because there has been no other way to settle international difficulties.

Mr. President, I desire to make just a few more remarks that will express better than anything I have said my views on the question that is now pending before us. Since the earliest days of civilization, statesmen and philosophers have dreamed that the day might come when the nations of the world would have a tribunal with power to determine international disputes.

Those who have held to that view justified their advocacy of such a tribunal largely on the ground that any controversy which might arise between the nations could be settled by rules of law rather than by resorting to arms. Those who have advocated such a tribunal have not always understood the difficulties in the establishment of such a court.

These difficulties, of course, grow out of intense nationalism, or what is ordinarily called "patriotism." Patriotism is a good thing. Patriotism is something that ought to dwell in the heart of every American; but superpatriotism, which seems to dwell in the bosoms of some of our Senators, is a bad thing; and when that which we call patriotism will lead us far enough to make us want to deprive someone else in the world of something that is justly his, it is a bad thing.

Nations have always been suspicious of each other, and have been afraid to submit a controversy to any tribunal whose members were not of their own nationality. They have been afraid of other nations, afraid that they would not get a square deal, afraid that they would not have a fair trial. That is just as true in our country today as it will be in the World Court. Every day we hear men saying, "We do not want this particular question to go to some court, because the court is swayed by some particular view that it has upon the question. We believe it is unwise to submit the case to some particular court." That goes on everywhere. In every State in the Union, in every county and municipality in every State, even in the Nation itself, men cry out and say, "We do not believe the courts are fair."

Mr. President, the courts are fair. They may make mistakes, but they are fair, and they do that which is best in the settlement of all disputes of every character. To say that some judge is of a different nationality from our own judges is a very unfair argument.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. LOGAN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. May I suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that in all cases of arbitration we, of course, have to submit our disputes to judges of other nationalities.

Mr. LOGAN. That is very true.

Mr. CONNALLY. There would be no difference between this Court and the arbitration tribunals in that respect.

Mr. LOGAN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senators who are afraid of the judges of the World Court if they are acquainted with the record, the standing, and the character of the three judges we have had on that Court. I should like to ask the distinguished Senators who say that the judges will be unfair because they are not of our nationality if they believe that Judge Charles E. Hughes, now Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, when he was a member of the World Court would have decided a case in favor of his own nation simply because he belonged to that nation. I resent any such argument. Judge Hughes would not have done it. Neither would Judge Kellogg do it. Neither would Judge Moore have done it. If the citizens of our Nation would not decide for our Nation simply because they were residents of it or belonged to it, I have no right to argue that the citizens of any other nation would be less fair than the citizens of our own Nation. I do not believe they would be less fair.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

Mr. LOGAN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. The Senator will recall that in the arbitration decisions, the *Alabama* case and many others that I might mention, where the judges, at least in part, were from other countries, we accepted the decisions. Only within the past 2 weeks a decision has been rendered against the United States in the *I'm Alone* case, where an American judge, a Justice of the Supreme Court, and one of the most distinguished lawyers of Canada sat, and the decision was against the United States, and we accepted it.

Mr. LOGAN. Very true.

Mr. KING. So that in the case of international tribunals to which we have appealed to settle controversies we have accepted the decisions, sometimes with rather poor grace; but, by and large, I think it may be said, from a dispassionate review of the decisions, that they were just and fair in the light of the facts that were presented.

Mr. LOGAN. I thank the Senator; and I believe it may be said that every decision which has been rendered up to the present time by the World Court has been accepted by all the parties to the controversy without a word.

It is the nationalistic feeling which has prevented the United States becoming a party to the World Court treaty. The failure to ratify the treaty and thereby adhere to the Court does not reflect credit upon the statesmen in the United States. Apparently they are afraid that the jurists and statesmen of other nations are so far superior to our own that we could not prove a match for them in a contest over disputed rights. Certainly there is no basis for such an opinion. The American statesmen and jurists are as able as any in all the world.

It is said that more than two-thirds of the Members of the United States Senate have favored adherence to the World Court for many years; and yet, for some reason unknown to the public generally, the treaty has not been ratified. I for one favor the ratification of the treaty at the earliest possible date.

Because of this position it is my purpose to make a few remarks dealing with the subject briefly, though to my own satisfaction.

We have historical data to show that the idea of a tribunal to settle international disputes is not a new one. More than 600 years ago, or, to be exact, about the year 1305, a Frenchman suggested the establishment of a court having jurisdiction to settle disputes among nations. Later, in 1623, another Frenchman was the author of a book which has been translated into English within the last few years, wherein he undertook to make suggestions for the establishment of such a court and as to the jurisdiction which it might exercise. Nothing ever came of the suggestions made by these Frenchmen during the next 250 years, but there was arbitration in 1872 between the United States and Great

Britain which revived the idea of an international court, and David Dudley Field outlined suggestions for an international code, which he published in 1876.

When McKinley became President, in his first inaugural address he stated that the "leading feature of our foreign policy throughout our entire national history" had been our insistance on "the adjustment of difficulties by judicial methods rather than by force of arms."

The First Peace Conference was held in The Hague in 1899, and the American delegation was instructed by President McKinley to act upon "the long-continued and widespread interest of the people of the United States in the establishment of an international court." The delegation presented to the Conference a plan, as did the delegates from other nations, and drew up a convention for the settlement of international disputes, and under that convention there was established the Permanent Court of Arbitration. The author, James Brown Scott, discusses this convention in his book, The Hague Peace Conference, at some length. When the American delegation returned it reported that this Permanent Court of Arbitration was a "thoroughly practical beginning" which would "produce valuable results from the outset", and would serve as the "germ out of which a better and better system will be gradually evolved."

The Permanent Court of Arbitration was organized in 1900, when The Hague Convention of 1899 became effective. There was no other peace conference at The Hague until 1907, at which time the convention of 1899 was revised and the maintenance of the Court was provided for. Nearly all of the important nations of the world became "contracting parties" to these conventions. Forty-six States became parties to it and have had a part in maintaining it.

The Permanent Court of Arbitration, however, was not really a court. It simply provided a reservoir from which nations might draw tribunals from time to time. Each State that became a contracting party was entitled to four members. The members held no meetings. The affairs of the Court are directed by an administrative council at The Hague composed of diplomatic representatives of States which are parties to the convention. A tribunal might consist of one person or as many as five. The members of the tribunal were not necessarily from States that were contracting parties. There have been many arbitrations before tribunals of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. The United States has been a party to 6 of these arbitrations: 1 with Mexico, 1 with Great Britain, 1 with Venezuela, 1 with Norway, 1 with the Netherlands, and 1 with Sweden.

Our delegates to the Second Peace Conference at The Hague received instructions from President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Root. These instructions were to bring about the development of the Permanent Court of Arbitration into a permanent tribunal composed of judges who are judicial officers and nothing else, who are paid adequate salaries, who have no other occupation, and who will devote their entire time to the trial and decision of international causes by judicial methods and under a sense of judicial responsibility.

As far back as 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt gave specific instructions that this Permanent Court of Arbitration, which then was no court at all, should be so changed that there should be a court, with judges, with salaries, who should give their entire time to the settlement of international disputes. This World Court idea is an American idea. The idea came from the United States and from some of the great men of the United States, as all of us must know.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LOGAN. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator, of course, is aware of the fact that Mr. Choate and our other representatives did everything in their power to carry out the instructions which had been given by Theodore Roosevelt, but the delegates to the Conference split upon this rock: they could not determine how the judges were to be selected. However, our representatives did everything they possibly could to bring about the establishment of a permanent court, one that would measure up to the requirements which have just been indicated in the instructions given by Mr. Roosevelt. Now, for the first time—notwithstanding that in the intervening years efforts have been made to determine how the judges should be selected—a plan was suggested in the Versailles Treaty which has met with the approval of a majority of the nations; in fact, all the nations of the world, perhaps, outside of the United States.

Mr. LOGAN. That is very true. They agreed upon this Court at the 1907 Conference. The functions of the Court, the purposes of the Court, were all agreed upon, as well as a code or a charter. The rock on which they split was the question of how the judges should be selected, and that was never determined until Mr. Root, who was also a representative of the United States in the 1907 convention, suggested the plan which was followed in selecting the judges of the World Court.

The delegations, representing the various states, were able to agree on a general plan for a new permanent court of arbitral justice, but they could not agree on a method of choosing the judges. The American delegation, however, was sufficiently encouraged to report—

> That the foundations of a permanent court have been broadly and firmly laid. * * * A little time, a little patience, and the great work is accomplished.

It has now been 27 years since the American delegation reported to the then President Roosevelt that a little time and a little patience were all that were necessary for the accomplishment of the great work. The people of the United States are still exercising the patience and still biding their time, but the Senate seems to ask of them to wait and show a greater degree of patience.

The plan which was proposed at the Second Hague Conference never became effective. Later Secretary of State Bacon proposed the establishment of an international prize court with the functions of the Permanent Court of Arbitral Justice, and his efforts followed by those of Secretary of State Knox; but they made little or no progress.

When the World War came on in 1914 there was no effective machinery for handling international disputes, and the only machinery of any kind was the Permanent Court of Arbitration. Perhaps there was no nation in the world that did not believe that when the war was ended a new court would be established, with full power to decide and determine international disputes. The matter, however, was not considered in detail at the Peace Conference, which drew up article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. This article directed the Council of the League to formulate and submit plans for the establishment of a permanent court of international justice.

That is what the League of Nations did at the time. Instead of its being a League of Nations court, the League of Nations appointed some jurists to meet and prepare a plan for the establishment of a court of international justice.

The Council expeditiously invited jurists to frame a plan for the new court. One was from Japan, 1 from Spain, 1 from Belgium, 1 from Brazil, 1 from Norway, 1 from France, 1 from the Netherlands, 1 from Great Britain, 1 from Italy, and 1 from the United States. These jurists met on the 16th of June 1920 and completed their work on July 24, 1920. Plans had been worked out by many of the neutral nations and many suggestions were made to this body of jurists. The American representative, Mr. Root, solved the difficulty of the method of electing judges. The result of the deliberation of the body of jurists was promptly submitted to the Council of the League of Nations early in August. It was debated by that body. It was finally adopted by the Assembly of the League on December 13, 1920. The project was approved by the Council and Assembly, and was annexed as a statute. The protocol constitutes what may be designated as an independent treaty, and has been signed on behalf of 55 states, and 49 of them have ratified the signatures. Under its provisions it was to become effective when ratified by 28 states; so it may be said that the Permanent Court of International

Justice became a fact in September 1921, when that number of states had ratified it.

The first election of judges was held during the same month, and a preliminary session was held at The Hague, beginning on January 30 and ending March 24, 1922. At the first session it was determined that all states may have access to the Court on equal terms, whether or not they are members of the League of Nations. In all, there are 69 states or members of the League of Nations which may resort to the Court for the settlement of disputes.

More than 30 sessions of the Court have been held; and in 11 years it handed down 21 judgments, 24 advisory opinions, and many orders. Crippled as it has been by the failure of the United States to adhere, yet it has settled a large number of international disputes; and no nation has shown its unwillingness to abide by a judgment of the Court.

The jurisprudence of the Court is an important contribution to international law. Its operation has been orderly. Administrative problems have been easy. The expenses of the Court run about $600,000 a year, and have been promptly paid by the governments whose duty it was to pay them.

Members of the Court are elected at the end of each 9-year period. The first election occupied 3 days, but the second election was completed in 1 day. Four special elections have been held to fill vacancies. Candidates are nominated by the national groups in the Permanent Court of Arbitration, and for states not represented in that body national groups created ad hoc. At first the United States declined to make any nominations; but since then it has regularly made nominations. The voting on the election of judges is conducted in the Assembly and in the Council of the League of Nations. All of the 57 members of the League may vote in the Assembly, and a proposal has been made which would enable states not members of the League but parties to the protocol of signature of 1920 to participate in the voting. Under the protocol for American adhesion, September 14, 1929, the United States would be permitted to vote in the elections, both in the Assembly and in the Council.

There are vested in the Permanent Court of International Justice two kinds of jurisdiction. It has jurisdiction over contentious cases. In such cases the jurisdiction of the Court must depend upon the consent of the parties, which may be given by special agreement submitting the particular case or by previous agreement conferring obligatory jurisdiction over cases of a certain kind. Many treaties and conventions contain such general agreements. In a recent report of the Court 443 treaties are listed as providing for its jurisdiction. The most fruitful source of obligatory jurisdiction is the optional clause, now binding on 41 states or members of the League of Nations.

The other kind of jurisdiction is what is known as advisory opinions. They may be requested by the Assembly or the Council of the League of Nations. The Council has requested 26 advisory opinions, but 1 request was withdrawn, and the Court declined jurisdiction on another request because it related to a dispute to which a state was a party without having given its consent. Advisory opinions have been given in 24 instances, and in each instance the opinion has done much toward the solution of an international question.

In 1928 the Assembly of the League decided that the statute should be considered with the object in view of amending it. A committee of jurists was designated to consider the matter, and met in Geneva in March 1929. The Honorable Elihu Root was a member of that committee of jurists. The committee recommended a number of changes, and at a conference of signatories in September 1929 certain amendments to the statute were agreed to and embodied in a protocol for a revision of the statute dated September 14, 1929. Cuba objected, and prevented the protocol becoming effective by September 1930, as had been the intention. Some of the desired results have been achieved by action of the Court in revising its rules, and by resolutions of the Assembly of the League. The judges were increased from 11 to 15. The amendments to the statute will become effective when ratifications of the revision protocol are deposited by all of the parties to the protocol of signature of December 16, 1920. Ratification has been made by 45 of the 49 parties.

Beginning in 1897 the United States, through those in highest authority, has advocated the establishment of such a court. Early in 1923 Secretary of State Hughes suggested to President Harding that the United States should do its part in maintaining the Court by adhering with four reservations to the protocol of signature of December 16, 1920. President Harding promptly asked the Senate for its advice and consent. On January 27, 1926, the Senate gave its advice and consent to adherence by the United States, subject to five reservations. The resolution of the Senate was communicated to the various states signatories to the protocol of signature. These states, through their representatives, held a conference at Geneva in 1926; but the United States refused to be represented, and decided that the reservations in the Senate resolution should be accepted on certain conditions. These conditions were unacceptable to the President of the United States, and nothing further was done until the negotiations were taken up again by Secretary of State Kellogg, when he addressed a letter in February 1929 to the Secretary General of the League of Nations. The Council of the League referred the matter to the committee of jurists which was to study the proposed revision of the Court's statute. This committee drafted a protocol for American adhesion, which was considered by a second conference of signatories in September 1929 and opened to signature on September 14, 1929.

The protocol for American adhesion has been signed by 54 states, including the United States, and ratified by 41 states. It cannot become effective until it is ratified by the United States on the one hand, and by all of the other states which may have ratified the protocol of signature of December 16, 1920.

I might say that, as all Senators well know, five men have served as the Chief Executive of our Nation since this question first arose: President Wilson, President Harding, President Coolidge, President Hoover, and President Roosevelt. Each one of those Presidents has requested of the Senate of the United States that it take such steps as were necessary to bring the United States into the World Court. The great Secretaries of State, such as Hughes and Stimson and Kellogg and Bacon, have advised that we ought to become members of the World Court, and yet for 13 years the Senate apparently has completely ignored its duty in connection with this matter.

It will be seen from this brief recital of the history of the Court that the idea of an international court is not a new one.

The Court is a part of the affairs of the world. Its importance will increase with the years. The United States should not longer delay the ratification of the protocol for American adhesion.

The statute of the Court has been discussed in the public press for the past 13 years, and I shall not take the time to go into that subject. The protocol for American adhesion is likewise familiar to the American public.

There seems to be no material objection to ratification on the part of the United States. No one, except a small group of irreconcilables, attempts to advance a reason why the Senate should not act at the earliest possible time. Our failure to act stamps us more and more as a hermit nation, unwilling to do our part toward substituting law for the settlement of international disputes and for the arbitrament of arms.

No one will gainsay the statement that the most important problem in the world is the working out of plans that will insure permanent and honorable peace among the nations. Those who advocate the establishment of a tribunal to settle international disputes are not afraid of war, but they believe that war is not a necessary function of nations, and that there has been continual progress toward the substitution of law for war since civilization began. When civilization has reached the highest ideals there can be no resort to war. As long as nations resort to war, society is imperfect. Civilization has always been progressive in character.

As proof that law has been gradually substituted for war since the beginning, let me say that before the beginning of government the individual was without law. He sought some favored spot, where he lived because of its natural advantages. These advantages were largely of food, water, and shelter. No law protected him in his right of occupancy. There was no government to which he could appeal for protection. The weapons which nature gave him and the strength of his sinews constituted his equipment for war, both defensive and offensive. If another sought that which he claimed as his own, he resorted to war. His life was one of constant warfare. In protecting what he claimed as his he waged defensive warfare, but if, perchance, he sought the favored spot of another, he engaged in a war of aggression. Then, there was no way of settling disputes other than by war; that is, individual warfare between man and man. Aside from his natural strength, one individual had little advantage over another. There was no agitation over the size of armies and navies.

In the course of time the individual gathered about him a family. The members of the same family did not engage in warfare with one another. Rules were evolved for family government. These rules were the law of the family and they were substituted for war; hence these were the beginnings of the abolition of war and the substitution of law. There was peace in the family household, but each family fought with every other family. There were more days of peace, but the battles involved a greater number of individuals.

Families grew into clans; members of the same clan did not make war on each other; they were governed by the rules of the clan. Law took the place of war in the lives of a greater number of people. This was another step in the abolition of war. Law had made gains and war had suffered losses, but a clan made war on other clans. War had not been abolished, but law had been substituted for war on a larger scale.

The clans developed into tribes and members of the same tribe did not make war on each other. Tribal laws governed the members. Again law had been substituted for war in a larger area.

Tribes developed into states. Those familiar with the history of the feudal days in England will well understand the welding of small warring groups into a great state, governed by laws. With the advent of states there was a further abolition of war. Law was forging its way to the front. The citizens of a state did not war with each other, but the laws of a state governed only those within that state. States made war on each other.

Then came the federation of states, resulting in the substitution of law for war in ever-increasing populations.

I do not mean to say that civil war did not prevail at times within a clan and tribe, or a state, but great progress had been made and law had been recognized as a substitute for war.

Should we say that any country is civilized if it allows its citizens to make war upon each other in the settlement of internal controversies? Should we say that any State of the United States is civilized if it should allow groups of its citizens to obtain by force what they could not obtain in the courts of law? The citizens of a State look to the law for the settlement of all internal disputes. The citizens of one State do not engage in warfare with the citizens of another State, because the laws of the States are the laws of the United States, affording an adequate remedy for the settlement of controveries by law rather than by war. Individuals and groups of individuals submit their controversies to legal tribunals. If a citizen of one State has a grievance against a citizen of another State, he looks only to the law for relief. If one State has a controversy with another State, there is no thought of war. The courts are the supreme power for ending disagreements. The judgment of the court may take from an adversary a vast domain, but it requires no army to put the judgment into effect. An individual, clothed with the majesty and authority of the law, finds no resistance to his official demands.

Peace among members of the human race has been achieved and brought to its present state through a process of education and growth, through a better understanding of each other. He who says that law cannot be substituted for war denies that society is capable of further progress and advance and believes that it has reached its zenith. If we measure the future with the rules of knowledge gleaned from the past, we must conclude that he who argues that war must continue as one of the legitimate functions of national existence is without the support of sociological history. Law prevents warfare among the states of the same nation. Law prevails in every part of the world and affords ample remedy for all wrongs, except the wrong of a nation against a nation. Society is divided into about 60 main groups called "governments." Each of these governments has supplanted war with law within the component parts of the same government. If these 60 governments can agree upon a tribunal or tribunals with judicial powers for the determination of international questions of disagreement, civilization will have taken its last step in the abolition of war.

No one will contend that any international agreement will entirely eliminate violation of the laws made for the settlement of international controversies; but the nations, or the citizens of nations, who should violate the laws for the settlement of such matters would become outlaws, and they could be made to atone to the offended law. The laws governing citizens of a State are frequently violated, but those disobedient to the laws know that organized society is behind the laws, and the punishment of offenders is measured by the laws themselves.

If the statesmen of the world are unable to establish a system of international laws regulating the offensive conduct of one nation toward another and to erect tribunals for the administration and enforcement of such laws, there is little hope for a long continuation of the present cycle of civilization. If this cycle fails to achieve universal peace, there will be a recession into that darkness from which the human race has toiled upward through the painful years. Like Moses, we stand on the mountain in sight of the Promised Land. Shall we take the other step, or shall we leave it to another age which, many thousand years in the future, may have again worked its way up from the depths?

It may not be actual war that destroys the nations of today. The mad race among them in preparation for war is probably as dangerous as war itself. The burden of it all rests on the bent backs of groaning humanity. Year after year the burdens grow heavier. A large part of the earnings of every citizen goes toward the payment of the costs. A large part of the time of every citizen is given in labor to support his government in its warlike activities. The increasing weight of these burdens is fast approaching oppression which has been the chief factor in the downfall of all nations.

It has been said frequently of late that it is possible to abolish poverty. If the money expended for and as a result of war should be expended for the welfare and happiness of the race, the result would be inconceivable. How useful it would be in the fostering of industries for the employment of millions; in the elimination of insanitary conditions in the great cities of the world; in affording opportunities for education and recreation; in the creation of beauty; in the promotion of health; in caring for the unfortunate, and in making happiness the dominant note in every voice and love the law guiding and governing every heart!

The World War shook the very foundation of society and obscured for the time civilization itself. History will never record its horrors. The imagination of man cannot grasp them. Hearts unnumbered were crushed, and sorrow inexpressible was brought into innumerable homes. The moving battle fronts, with carnage-filled trenches, presented a picture that no painter will ever put on canvas, scenes that no sculptor will ever chisel, an epic which no poet will ever give to the world, events that no historian will ever narrate. For more than 4 years the thunder of guns drowned the voices of the world. Mothers prayed that the nations be made sane again. In the darkness of that night hope was

born—a hope that the sacrifice might not be in vain—that it was a war to end war. Responsible leaders, impelled by the pressure of public opinion, began to whisper it about that such an unholy spectacle must not again deluge the world in blood.

Then peace came, with its staggering problems. The Treaty of Versailles, with the League of Nations Covenant and provision for a World Court, was the first step toward peace among the nations. One day the world will erect monuments of enduring marble to the memory of those who wrought there; and, among that number, no one wrote his name in larger letters of living light on that immortal page of history than that statesman, philosopher, and prophet, the then President of the United States, the friend of society, Woodrow Wilson. He gave his life for a cause more sacred than any other—the cause of humanity.

There was joy in the hearts of the peoples of the nations when the treaty was signed. The representatives of the nations had opened a door of hope. The United States, for reasons known only to some of her statesmen, failed to carry on. I make no criticism of her conduct. There were currents and cross currents then that beclouded the visions of men. The heart of the people of the United States has always been true to the ideals of those who believe in law as a substitute for war. Our people have not grown faint in their adherence to the idea that finally the nations, acting in unison, will set up the necessary machinery for the abolition of war. No political party in the United States has ever declared against a working agreement which will promote and insure peace among the nations. Our Nation has moved with hesitating steps, but with unfaltering vision, in the path that leads to international concord.

The League of Nations was offered to the world at a time most unpropitious. The fires of nationalism burned brightly and nations were suspicious of each other. It is no cause for wonder that the United States held back, fearing what she might encounter just around the corner. But that is in the past. We did not go in. There has never been a plebiscite on the question. The political campaign of 1920, between the Democrats and Republicans, resulted in no decision against an international agreement. The Democrats declared for a League of Nations with the World Court. A few days prior to the election, the ablest and most outstanding leaders of the Republican Party, including the now ex-President Hoover, issued a manifesto to the American people, advising the voters that the quickest way to get into a league with other nations was to elect the Republican candidates. The question has been an issue in no other campaign. The League has made fair progress notwithstanding the hesitant policy of the United States toward it. It has amply justified its existence; but the question is not whether we shall become a member of the League of Nations. The question now before the Senate is whether we will give our consent to adherence of our Nation to the World Court. The question is whether we are willing to make an honest attempt to substitute law for war.

I have little patience with those who seem to believe that American statesmen are no match for the statesmen of other nations and that we are so unsophisticated in the ways of the world that advantage would be taken of us, if we should submit controversies to the World Court. There is too much depending upon our action for us longer to hesitate. We should speak clearly the voice of the American people, and that voice has been crying throughout the years that we join with other nations in substituting law for war. As an humble Member of this august body, the vote which I shall cast for the ratification of this treaty will afford me more pleasure than any vote that I have cast as a Member of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

THE WORLD COURT RESERVATION BY SENATOR LONG

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent to send to the desk at this time a reservation intended to be proposed by me to the resolution of adherence to the World Court protocols, and ask that it be printed.

The reservation intended to be proposed by Mr. LONG was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved further, That adherence to the protocols and statute is upon the express condition and understanding that the doctrine pronounced by President James Monroe, known and commonly called the "Monroe Doctrine", is and shall in no manner be affected or modified by the said World Court, and that the rights and duties assumed and heretofore exercised by the United States under said Monroe Doctrine shall never be affected by the said World Court.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED AND NOMINATION WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ADAMS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting several nominations in the Army and withdrawing a nomination, which were referred to the appropriate committee or ordered to lie on the table.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, before the roll is called I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if it is desired further to continue the session today?

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand there are some reports to be submitted. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who is momentarily absent, asked that I should have a quorum called at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Coolidge	King	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Copeland	La Follette	Reynolds
Austin	Costigan	Lewis	Robinson
Bachman	Couzens	Logan	Russell
Bailey	Davis	Lonergan	Schall
Bankhead	Dickinson	Long	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Donahey	McCarran	Sheppard
Barkley	Duffy	McGill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Fletcher	McNary	Smith
Black	Frazier	Maloney	Steiwer
Bone	Gerry	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Glass	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Gore	Moore	Townsend
Bulow	Guffey	Murphy	Trammell
Burke	Hale	Murray	Truman
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hastings	Norris	Van Nuys
Capper	Hatch	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Clark	Johnson	Pittman	Wheeler
Connally	Keyes	Pope	White

Mr. LEWIS. I make the same announcements with reference to absent Senators as were made on an earlier roll call and ask that the announcements stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first nomination in order on the calendar.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James A. Moffett, of New York, to be Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Fried, of New York, to be supervising inspector, Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent that nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask unanimous consent that nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. That completes the call of the Executive Calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask that the Senate resume legislative session.

The Senate resumed legislative session.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. POPE, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill (S. 1190) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 14) thereon.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. McNARY, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 617) for the relief of Roy Alvey Jones, and it was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 269) granting an annuity to Samuel R. Stone, and that it be referred to the Committee on Civil Service. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY]. In my opinion, the reference to the Committee on Finance was erroneous. I have talked with the Senator from Ohio about it, and he has no objection to the bill being referred as indicated.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the change of reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ADAMS in the chair). Without objection, the Committee on Finance will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and it will be referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1934.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1935.*

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the eighty-fifth annual report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1934.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1935.*

REPORT OF PERRY'S VICTORY MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Library, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Fifteenth Annual Report of the Perry's Victory Memorial Commission for the year ended December 1, 1934.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1935.*

REPORT OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Alaska Railroad for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1934.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1935.*

(NOTE: Report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.)

PUBLISHERS' CODES—ADDRESS BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I offer for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief address by Walter Lippmann on the subject of Publishers' Codes.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 17, 1935]

LIPPMANN ADVISES PUBLISHERS TO REFUSE CODE WHEN N. I. R. A. ENDS—EVEN THE BEST MAY PAVE WAY FOR CENSORSHIP AND SHOULD NEVER BE ACCEPTED, HE SAYS AT BOOK ASSOCIATION LUNCHEON; REVIEWER CRITICIZES CRITICS

Even the best of codes may pave the way for a bad one, and hence should never be accepted by any publisher who values the freedom of the press, Walter Lippmann said in a speech before the luncheon of the National Association of Book Publishers, following their annual meeting yesterday in the Ambassador Hotel. He urged them to ask for no code and to accept none when the N. I. R. A. expires next June.

"They tell us", he said, "that General Johnson and Mr. Richberg and the President are devoted to the freedom of the press and have no desire to censor it. But they are not immortal, and I do not know, and you do not know, who are going to be in the seats of authority 10, 20, or 50 years hence. The freedom of the press is much too important a thing to be dealt with on the notion that intelligent and well-intentioned men happen at this moment to be in power in Washington."

SEES PATH TO CENSORSHIP

Censorship of the press through a code could be accomplished, he said, by imposing high scales of wages and building requirements that would force the radical publishers, usually the less wealthy ones, out of business. Or, if the Government wished to muzzle the conservative press, he added, this could be done by regulation of advertising and "a few other aspects of the publishing business."

Christopher Morley, toastmaster at the luncheon, remarked that in his opinion the question of freedom of the press was settled if the publisher "prints the same thing exactly as the author wants it", and that "conditions of sale have nothing to do with freedom of the press."

"There is also another right to be considered", he said, "and that is the right of the small bookseller to make a living."

Clifton Fadiman, book reviewer of the New Yorker and connected with the publishing firm of Simon & Schuster, launched a vigorous attack on the growing tendency toward "grand chamism" in literary criticism—the growth of personal prestige to the point where a single man's words may make the success of a book or ruin its possibilities.

"The reviewer", he said, "has assumed far too great importance in the life of book publishers. I deplore the tendency to publish with certain reviewers in mind."

Publishers should remember, Mr. Fadiman added, "that there is the story of the boy who cried 'Wolf!' too often, and that it is possible also for a reviewer to 'go quietly mad' once too often."

CALLS CRITICS SPINELESS

Mr. Fadiman said that the atmosphere in relations between publishers and reviewers should be "one of healthy suspicion" and that, like some other things, such relations were "most pure when slightly strained." As an example of the dangers of too

much friendliness between publisher and critic, he cited the present state of English criticism, which he said had become "almost completely spineless."

Archibald MacLeish, former Pulitzer prize winner in poetry, a member of the staff of Fortune, told the assembled publishers that the very element that made the success of publishers and critics—timeliness—was the thing it was most necessary for a writer to avoid if he wished to do great work.

He suggested that perhaps publishers might be more successful in unearthing works of genius "in the occasional slim volumes of some young poets rather than in all the catalogs and all the blurbs of their competitors."

Mr. MacLeish said that it was his opinion that there was too much talk of "the revolution" in contemporary writing and not enough real revolution. The distinction between the two, he explained, was that "the revolution" was the political and economic revolution produced by class struggle, while "revolution" was simply the progression of ideas, the work usually of poets, which would produce their political and social effects only after a century or more.

LIPPMANN'S ADDRESS

The complete text of Mr. Lippmann's address follows:

"Mr. Norton has asked me once or twice to give him a title for what I am going to say. I haven't thought of one yet. But I can describe my general intentions. Having had an excellent luncheon with the publishers I propose to bite the hands that have fed me by arguing that since the summer of 1933 the publishers of books, magazines, and newspapers have exhibited an alarmingly inadequate understanding of what it means to protect the freedom of the press and that they have gravely compromised the basic principles of that freedom.

"I refer to their acceptance of N. R. A. codes and their willingness to permit the Federal Government to put the Blue Eagle on their publications as a sign of approval. For I take the position—and I am going to argue it here today—that publishing should never have been put under N. R. A., that the administration should never have been permitted, without a struggle carried right up to the Supreme Court, to impose codes, and that publishers should never have accepted them voluntarily.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

"What are these codes? They are Federal laws enforceable in the Federal courts. Under these laws the Federal Government undertakes to regulate hours, wages, the relations between publisher, editor, and writer, the costs of production, the method of distributing what is written. These are specific Federal regulations applying to different sorts of publications. Now, I say that when publishers and editors and writers accept the principle that a government authority may make specific laws for books, magazines, and newspapers, they have accepted an evil precedent which threatens the freedom of the press. They have admitted that the government may regulate the economic basis of the press, and if a government can regulate the economic basis of the press, it can regulate what is printed by the press.

PRECEDENT FOR MISCHIEF

"They tell us that General Johnson and Mr. Richberg and the President are devoted to the freedom of the press and have no desire to censor it. I believe that. I have never doubted it. But they are not immortal, and I do not know and you do not know who are going to be in the seats of authority 10, 20, or 50 years hence. The freedom of the press is much too important a thing to be dealt with on the notion that intelligent and well-intentioned men happen at this moment to be in power in Washington. It has to be guarded, as the most sacred part of our heritage and the foundation of all our other liberties, on the presumption that sometime or other, in the midst of a crisis we cannot now foresee, attempts will be made to destroy the freedom of the press. The liberties of man are not yet so secure that they do not have to be defended with the utmost vigilance. And I say that if ever the attempt is made to destroy the freedom of the press these codes will furnish the means to do it and the precedent by which it can be done.

EXAMPLES OF DANGER

"Let me tell you how it can be done. Suppose you wished to throttle the publication of progressive and radical books, magazines, and newspapers. You would recognize that by and large their publishers are the economically weaker members of the publishing business. On the whole they pay lower salaries; they are published in poorer buildings. All right. With the help of a clever lawyer and an architect it would be no great trick at all to put building regulations into a code which was ostensibly designed to protect newspaper workers from fire and from disease, but would in fact, if enforced, make it impossibly expensive for many small, weak publishers to exist. It would then be possible to set a scale of wages and hours which only the richest, which is likely to mean the more conservative, publishers could afford.

"On the other hand, with the help of experts, it would be feasible to throttle the conservatives almost as effectively if you will let me write codes to regulate advertising and a few other aspects of the publishing business. Give me the right to regulate the economic basis of publishing and I'll regulate publishing, perhaps not quite so effectively as Dr. Goebbels, but effective enough.

"You may say these things won't happen. It is enough for me that they could happen. If someone stood up in Washington and said, 'Let us have a press censor; he will be very liberal * * *' would you agree to that? You would not. Well, I say you should not have agreed to let the Government impose codes regulating the business of publishing, no matter how confident you felt that the codes would not now interfere with the freedom of the press. A good censor is still bad, because you know that he might easily be followed by a bad censor. By the same token, a good code is bad because it might easily become a bad code.

CODES ARE SPECIFIC LAWS

"I know the arguments of those who defend the codes. Aren't publishers business men, they say, and why, as business men working for profit, should they escape regulation that applies to other business men? Those who use this argument have never, I believe, understood the real point at issue. The codes are specific laws applying to specific industries. And they can, therefore, be manipulated—and, in fact, have been manipulated in many cases—to promote particular interests and policies for that industry.

"I have no objection, of course, to general laws which apply to all business men, publishers included. I am not arguing that publishers should be exempt from, let us say, a child-labor law; I am arguing that the Government, and especially executive officials, shall not make a particular law applying to newsboys. I am not suggesting that publishers should not have to obey labor laws. I am objecting to special labor laws for the publishing industry. The point is important. I hope I can make it clear. Perhaps this illustration will make it clearer. There is no reason why publishers should not pay taxes just like any other business men. But there would be the greatest possible objection to a special tax on publications. For a special tax could be used in the future, as it has been in the past, to control what is published and therefore to destroy the freedom of the press.

"I am afraid I have gone beyond my allotted time. I apologize, but this thing has been in my mind since the N. R. A. was launched and, like Dr. Condon, I have to talk. I am worried by the ease with which men, who have devoted their lives to fighting for freedom of speech, have lost their bearings in this affair.

SHOULD ACCEPT NO CODE

"Surely, the only position for publishers, editors, and writers to take is that they are subject to the general laws of the land, within the guaranties of the Constitution, and that for the rest they will ask no favors from the Government. They will accept no favors from the Government. They will recognize no authority in the Government to regulate them specifically.

"And that, therefore, when the N. I. R. A. expires in June they will ask for no code and accept none, and that they are removing the Blue Eagle from their publications because the right to publish in America is guaranteed by the Constitution, and no license, no decoration, no official stamp of any kind is necessary, is desirable, is consistent with the American tradition of the freedom of the press."

At their business meeting in the morning the National Association of Book Publishers elected W. W. Norton, president of W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., president of their association for 1935. Other officers elected were D. L. Chambers, of Bobbs-Merrill Co., first vice president; Curtis W. McGraw, of the McGraw-Hill Book Co., second vice president; Howard C. Lewis, of Dodd, Mead & Co., third vice president; Richard J. Walsh, of the John Day Co., fourth vice president; Stanley M. Rinehart, of Farrar & Rinehart, secretary; and Thayer Hobson, of William Morrow & Co., treasurer.

Editorial problems, publishers' relations with book sellers, librarians, and book manufacturers, and activities of the association's credit bureau during the last year were among the subjects discussed at the business meeting, which was closed to the press.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the inaugural address of George H. Earle, Governor of Pennsylvania, delivered on Jan. 15, 1935, at Harrisburg, Pa. The address appears in the RECORD, p. 624, as part of the remarks of Hon. HENRY ELLENBOGEN, a Representative from Pennsylvania.]

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. ROBINSON. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 21, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 18 (legislative day of Jan. 17), 1935

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE CAPTAIN

First Lt. Thomas William Munford, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 14, 1935.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Second Lt. Carl Bascombe Herndon, Infantry, from December 1, 1934.

Second Lt. Charles Guthrie Rau, Infantry, from December 1, 1934.

Second Lt. Pearl Harvey Robey, Air Corps, from December 1, 1934.

Second Lt. Charles Glendon Williamson, Air Corps, from December 3, 1934.

Second Lt. James Julius Winn, Infantry, from December 5, 1934.

Second Lt. Wesley Carlton Wilson, Infantry, from December 9, 1934.

Second Lt. John Lyford Horner, Jr., Quartermaster Corps, from December 12, 1934.

Second Lt. Daniel Fulbright Walker, Field Artillery, from December 12, 1934.

Second Lt. John Kauffman Bryan, Field Artillery, from December 16, 1934.

Second Lt. George Putnam Moody, Air Corps, from December 26, 1934.

Second Lt. Nelson Marquis Lynde, Jr., Infantry, from December 31, 1934.

Second Lt. Charles Dudley Wiegand, Infantry, from January 1, 1935.

Second Lt. Charles Howard Treat, Infantry, from January 1, 1935.

Second Lt. Thomas Bolyn Smothers, Jr., Infantry, from January 1, 1935.

Second Lt. John Francis Regis Seitz, Infantry, from January 1, 1935.

Second Lt. Bruce Easley, Jr., Infantry, from January 1, 1935.

Second Lt. Edgar Wright, Jr., Infantry, from January 1, 1935.

Second Lt. William Lester Nave, Infantry, from January 1, 1935.

Second Lt. Edward Edgecombe Cruise, Infantry, from January 1, 1935.

Second Lt. Brendan McKay Greeley, Infantry, from January 1, 1935.

Second Lt. Ralph Copeland Cooper, Field Artillery, from January 7, 1935.

Second Lt. John Ambrose Geary, Infantry, from January 8, 1935.

Second Lt. John Warren Joyes, Jr., Infantry, from January 8, 1935.

Second Lt. Everett Clifton Hayden, Quartermaster Corps, from January 14, 1935.

Second Lt. William Henry Shimonek, Infantry, from January 14, 1935.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 18 (legislative day of Jan. 17), 1935

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATOR

James A. Moffett to be Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration.

SUPERVISING INSPECTOR, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION AND STEAMBOAT INSPECTION

George Fried to be supervising inspector, Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection.

COAST GUARD

PROMOTIONS

To be district commanders

Charles Walker
Irwin Burton Steele
Martinus Peter Jensen

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Charles B. Arrington
Robert T. Alexander
Edward A. Eve, Jr.
Howard A. Morrison
Eric A. Anderson
Marion Amos
Halmar J. Webb
Frank A. Erickson
Victor F. Tydlacka
William D. Shields
Richard E. Morrell
Aden C. Unger
George I. Holt
Simon R. Sands, Jr.
Donald M. Morrison
Henry U. Scholl
Christopher Copeland Knapp
Joseph E. Madacey
Elmer E. Comstock
Elmer J. J. Suydam
Rufus E. Mroczkowski
James Plakias
Oscar C. B. Wev
Ned W. Sprow
William I. Swanston
William E. Creedon
Henry A. Meyer
Preston B. Mavor

To be commodore on the retired list

Benjamin M. Chiswell

To be captains

Howard E. Rideout
Ralph W. Dempwolf
Roger C. Weightman

POSTMASTERS

INDIANA

Otto N. Hennefent, Alexandria.
Harry L. Brendel, Anderson.
Rena Zehr, Berne.
William W. Houk, Brazil.
James R. McDonald, Brookville.
Roy D. Haines, Bryant.
Ralph D. Barry, Crandall.
Beatrice Bales, Dana.
John A. Donohue, Elwood.
Fay A. Crandall, Gas City.
J. Russell Smith, Gosport.
Dorothy V. Prall, Henryville.
Herbert J. Harris, Hillsboro.
Samuel S. Foor, Macy.
Charles H. Wilson, Mooresville.
Orville R. Wells, Morgantown.
Henry H. Powell, Newburgh.
Retta M. House, North Salem.
Edward P. Donnar, Oaktown.
Benjamin F. Phipps, Pendleton.
James R. Morrissey, Peru.
Earl J. McWilliams, Plainville.
Ivan R. Huxford, Rosedale.
Albert J. Anderson, Shirley.
Mildred B. Mitchell, Shoals.
Ralph E. Fox, South Whitley.
Elsie E. Mitchell, Sweetsers.
Albert Rautenkranz, Urbana.
Benjamin B. Plummer, Windfall.

IOWA

Anna V. McDonnell, Adair.
Ambrose J. Leinhauser, Agency.
Joseph W. Weber, Alta Vista.
Frank B. Baldwin, Cedar Rapids.
John B. Taylor, Centerville.
Lester A. Falcon, Central City.
Robert H. Stoneking, Cushing.
Earl P. Patten, Danbury.
Anna M. Stephenson, Deep River.
Cecil W. Langmann, Durant.
Harry L. Conway, Elma.
Hans P. Hansen, Jr., Exira.
Jacob S. Forgrave, Farmington.
Edward H. Schnebel, Farnhamville.
Harry W. Kelly, Grandmound.
Gertrude Posten, Gravity.
Howard Colon, Hamburg.
Hal W. Campbell, Harlan.
Thomas H. Thompson, Kanawha.
John E. Leinen, Keota.
George A. Norelius, Kiron.
Richard A. Dunlevy, Lansing.
John E. McHugh, Lisbon.
Darrell C. Laurenson, Moorhead.
Mattie M. Bridges, Moville.
Tracy R. Osborne, New Sharon.
Ben Jensen, Onawa.
Frank H. Peckosh, Oxford Junction.
Clarence J. Bunkers, Remsen.
Andrew L. Anderson, Ringsted.
Harve E. Munson, Rippey.
Andrew M. Simonson, Rolfe.

Hans M. Mohr, Sabula.
Peter C. Hollander, Schleswig.
Alfred P. Harder, Shelby.
Ida E. Larson, Swea City.
Glen P. Weatherhead, Tabor.
Richard P. Tank, Walcott.
John F. Zimpfer, Walker.
Jack G. Chapman, Washta.
Hazel H. Gerdes, Wesley.
Clarence P. Lietsch, West Burlington.
Grace G. Patterson, Westside.
William Hoker, Wheatland.
Ernest Reitz, Wyoming.

KANSAS

Ruskin R. Couch, Anthony.
Horace G. Bodwell, Arlington.
John G. O'Neil, Beattie.
Robert E. Lee, Englewood.
Wilsey E. Stout, Medicine Lodge.
Benjamin F. McKim, Morrill.
John J. Appelhans, Spearville.

MASSACHUSETTS

Frederick J. Wangler, Beverly Farms.
Charles L. Jepson, Cheshire.
Mark W. Supple, Easthampton.
Grace G. Kempton, Farnumsville.
John R. Fales, Foxboro.
Wayne A. Smith, Griswoldville.
Kathryn N. Gibbons, Hingham Center.
Ella M. Harrington, Jefferson.
Agnes M. Butler, Millville.
John J. Stewart, North Scituate.
Richard J. Specht, West Springfield.

MISSISSIPPI

William C. Bailey, Como.
Thomas R. Armstrong, Edwards.
Ruth P. Therrell, Florence.
Jefferson D. Fogg, Hernando.
Robert R. Smith, Poplarville.
Edgar L. Dear, Sledge.
Emma D. Barkley, State Line.

NEVADA

Dora E. Kappler, Carlin.
Milo W. Craig, Montello.
Delevan F. Defenbaugh, Winnemucca.

NORTH DAKOTA

Raymond P. Everson, Alamo.
Benjamin Wright, Antler.
Robert L. Peterson, Bisbee.
Ernest W. Kibler, Cavalier.
Alice M. Sorlie, Churchs Ferry.
Olive M. Bartlett, Cogswell.
Oscar Lange, Kulm.
John H. Bellon, Lehr.
James E. Jones, Lisbon.
H. C. Erhart Petersen, Makoti.
Christine Loken, Petersburg.
Joseph G. Kringlie, Portland.
John K. Diehm, Schafer.
Paul G. Wagner, Sentinel Butte.
Franklin E. Reiman, White Earth.

OREGON

Neta Daly, Beaverton.
William W. Lower, Creswell.
David C. Evans, Dufur.
Erma L. Basford, Florence.
Grace M. Ely, Gladstone.
Alice J. Nebel, Glendale.
Maude Sears, Halfway.
James W. Drinkard, Halsey.
Ella M. Eaton, Jacksonville.
C. Verdo Fairchild, Joseph.
Victor Eckley, La Grande.
L. Lee Mead, Nehalem.
Robert W. Zevely, Prineville.
Jennie J. Shatto, Scappoose.
Harry M. Stewart, Springfield.
Lisle W. Tame, Talent.

VIRGINIA

Harvey R. Stebbins, Ashland.
Paul B. Hilliard, Ballston.
Edgar E. Shannon, Bland.
George W. Garvin, Boyce.
William T. Paxton, Buena Vista.
J. Long Haley, Cheriton.
Newman M. Conant, Chincoteague Island.
Cornelia L. Patton, Clinchco.
Janie M. Mason, Colonial Beach.
Lewis A. Ashton, Dahlgren.
John D. Webb, Disputanta.
D. Irvine Persinger, Eagle Rock.
Elizabeth L. MacMillan, Glasgow.
Robert A. Smith, Gordonsville.
Annie R. Walker, Herndon.
Gordon P. Murray, Hollins.
Henry L. Munt, Hopewell.
Charlie S. Farmer, Jetersville.
Joseph L. Blackburn, Kenbridge.
Edward M. Blake, Kilmarnock.
Ruth K. Northington, Lacrosse.
Thomas E. Warriner, Lawrenceville.
Samuel B. Henson, Louisa.
John H. Cave, Lynchburg.
Milton E. Gee, Meherrin.
Thomas M. Hesson, Monroe.
James M. Shannon, Mount Jackson.
George E. McInteer, Quantico.
Hollis H. Howard, Radford.
Ernest L. Keyser, Roanoke.
Vernon C. Dotson, St. Charles.
Ward S. Atkinson, Shawsville.
Marion W. Sherman, Shipman.
Edwin J. Shuler, Stanley.
William B. Cocke, Jr., Stony Creek.
Samuel B. Harper, Stuarts Draft.
Henry C. Snyder, Troutville.
Clifford E. Hafdy, Victoria.
Benjamin N. Hubbard, White Stone.
Merritt W. Foster, Williamsburg.

WISCONSIN

John C. Will, Arkansaw.
Otto Hussa, Bangor.
Jerome A. Casey, Bloomington.
Lena K. Herning, Cecil.
Myrvin C. Hoey, Centuria.
Lincoln C. Holmes, Clear Lake.
Ina E. Hennlich, Curtiss.
Willis Engebretsen, Eagle.
Randolph W. LeTourneau, Fifield.
John H. Poh, Forestville.
Isabelle C. Spang, Franksville.
Mathew E. Lang, Gillett.
Bernard L. Slota, Gilman.
Raymond W. Burt, Goodman.
Joseph W. Sazama, Hatley.
John P. Peterson, Hawkins.
Alma M. Olk, Hortonville.
Ernest G. Ross, Hudson.
Philip A. Panetti, Hustisford.
Roger R. Austin, Lancaster.
Orin W. Livingston, Livingston.
Florence H. P. Stabnow, Loganville.
Ernest A. J. Samson, Manawa.
Harry F. Kelley, Manitowoc.
Paul O. Anderson, Nelson.
Neil A. Tarr, New Auburn.
Jacob Werner, New London.
Gustave V. Anderson, Ogema.
Edward Stackman, Ontario.

Harry V. Holden, Orfordville.
Harry P. Walker, Plainfield.
Laura H. Culver, Pound.
Tony Efta, Pulaski.
Agna Means, Rothschild.
Walter P. Stephan, Sawyer.
Jeannette L. Andrews, South Wayne.
Laurence Driscoll, Spencer.
Ferdinand A. Hirzy, Stevens Point.
Mabel E. Johnson, Stockholm.
Gaylord Helmick, Three Lakes.
Nyole E. Creed, Unity.
Robert L. Graves, Viroqua.
Edmund O. Johnson, Warrens.
Harold J. Christ, Wausaukee.
Christian R. Mau, West Salem.
Frank L. Daniels, Weyerhauser.
Albert L. Brossard, Winnebago.
Joseph P. Wheir, Wisconsin Rapids.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate January 18 (legislative day of Jan. 17), 1935

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

Hampton Robb, of Connecticut, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 18, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. A. C. Millar, editor of the Arkansas Methodist, Little Rock, Ark., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we rejoice in the privilege of calling Thee our Father. We thank Thee for the multiplied mercies and blessings we have received. We have had our troubles, our trials, our tribulations; and yet, in spite of all these things, we have been the objects of Thy mercy and Thy love.

We come with humble hearts and ask Thy pardon for our individual and collective sins. We pray that Thou wouldst bless each one of us. We pray Thy blessings upon our Nation, that we may be a people who love and honor Thee and seek to promote righteousness in the world. We pray Thy blessings upon the President and the Congress, upon all who are in authority, that these may be men who serve not merely a human constituency but who serve Thee as far as they can understand how to serve the God of the universe.

We pray Thy especial blessing upon the individual Members of this body, that each one may seek to live a good life and may seek to follow the principles of truth and righteousness and may endeavor to meet the expectation of those who have reposed confidence in Thee. Bless us in this hour and continue to bless us, we beg. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3410. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 10, 1935.

Hon. JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Rhode Island my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the First District of Rhode Island, to take effect at midnight tonight.

With great respect,
Your obedient servant,

FRANCIS B. CONDON.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, sections 175 and 176, United States Code, the Chair appoints the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH] members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

AIRPLANES

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 59

Resolved, That for the purpose of obtaining information necessary as a basis for legislation the Committee on Military Affairs of the Seventy-fourth Congress is authorized, as a committee, by subcommittee or otherwise, to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 275 of the Seventy-third Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon the Committee on Military Affairs by House Resolution 275 of the Seventy-third Congress. The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $30,000 under House Resolution 284 and House Resolution 439 of the Seventy-third Congress is hereby continued for such purposes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina very kindly consulted me in regard to this resolution. I think this committee has done some good work. The gentleman from South Carolina informs me that the work is not entirely completed, however, and that there are several other matters that should be attended to in connection with this investigation. So far as I know, there is no opposition on this side against the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the reading of the Journal next Monday, I be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes on Two Safeguards to Free Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

"HOT OIL"—CAN CONGRESS PROHIBIT INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN PETROLEUM PRODUCED IN EXCESS OF STATE ALLOWABLES?

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of the petroleum industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, throughout the investigation of the petroleum industry by the Cole committee it was urged that Congress continue in force the substance of the Connally amendment—section 9 (c) of the National Industrial Recovery Act—forbidding the movement in interstate commerce of hot oil, that is, crude oil or its products produced in excess of allowables fixed by State law. So far as I recall this view was unanimously presented. State officials, majors, and independents united in advocating such legislation.

The United States Supreme Court in the Panama and Amazon cases has just held that section 9 (c), as drawn in 1933, was invalid in that it conferred upon the President the power to prohibit or not prohibit "hot oil" in his own unlimited discretion and was therefore an unconstitutional attempt to delegate legislative power. The Court said:

The Congress left the matter to the President without standard or rule, to be dealt with as he pleased. * * * If section 9 (c) were held valid, * * * Congress could at will and as to such subjects as it chooses transfer that (the law-making) function to the President.

In brief, the Court held that 9 (c), if valid, could be extended in such way as to convert a representative government into a dictatorship.

Despite this salutary reminder that the Constitution is still the supreme law of the land, it seems to be assumed, again almost without question, that if the vice of delegating unlimited power to the President were removed, Congress can nevertheless either delegate that power to be exercised within charted boundaries, or that Congress can directly prohibit the shipment of "hot oil", as defined by State law, from an oil-producing to the oil-consuming States. Bills have been presented by Senator CONNALLY and Representative DISNEY to prohibit such shipment.

Before embarking on another effort to corral "hot oil" it may be worth while for Congress and the petroleum industry generally to examine a little more critically the assumption upon which the proposed legislation rests.

Let it be understood that we are here dealing with constitutional power, rather than the question of the desirability of conserving our indispensable natural and national resources or of stabilizing a great industry. The Supreme Court will still continue as an ex post facto partner in petroleum legislation.

I therefore raise this question: Does Congress have the power to forbid the facilities of interstate commerce to petroleum, or other commodities, produced in excess of the law of the State of its production?

This question remains undecided by the Amazon-Panama decision. Justice Hughes, speaking for the majority of eight, said:

> Assuming for the present purpose, *without deciding*, that Congress has power to interdict the transportation of that excess in interstate and foreign commerce—

And so forth.

Justice Cardozo, who dissented, said:

> There could surely be no question as to the validity of an act whereby carriers would be prohibited from transporting oil produced in contravention of a statute, if in the judgment of the (Interstate Commerce) Commission the practice was demoralizing the market and bringing disorder and insecurity into the national economy.

To this observation of Justice Cardozo it may be pointed out that in using the words "in contravention of a statute" he does not state explicitly whether he means a Federal or a State statute, although he probably meant the latter, nor is it plain that he had considered the broader implications of the question to which I now advert. In any event, from Justice Hughes' language it is clear that the Court did not decide whether Congress may prohibit the movement of oil denominated as "hot", not by its own law, but by the law of a State.

The question is: Does legislation of this general character amount to a regulation of interstate commerce by the State and not by the National Government? If so, is it valid? Can Congress delegate its exclusive power to regulate interstate commerce to a State? Can it consent to the States exercising that power?

Here is an oil-producing State. It determines or confers upon its State officials the power to determine how much oil shall be produced in that State and to brand all oil produced in excess of that determination as contraband. Congress says the contraband shall not leave that State. This, of course, denies to the other States and the oil consumers of the Nation the right to obtain and use that excess oil, whatever the amount may be, as fixed by the oil-producing State. The oil-producing State does not act in the national interest or from a national viewpoint. It acts in its own interest. It acts to conserve its natural resources. It acts also to raise the price of oil and thus benefit its own citizens. One month it may produce and ship to the oil-consuming States 500,000 barrels; the next month 600,000; the next 300,000; the next, conceivably, none at all. Congress interdicts all oil in excess of this fluctuating allowable, and does so in advance.

It is clear from this that the State actually determines from month to month the amount of oil that enters interstate commerce. Is this a regulation of commerce? Congress, representing the Nation and the national as opposed to a local interest, exercises no discretion in the matter of how much that amount shall be. It handcuffs itself to the State. Congress is the tail. The State is the dog. The dog wags the tail. Whatever the State does or may do, Congress ratifies in advance. Congress, in effect, transfers to the State the determination of how much oil shall enter interstate commerce.

Is this an unconstitutional exercise by the State of the power to regulate commerce among the several States? Is it an unconstitutional surrender by Congress of its power to regulate that commerce?

These are questions of far-reaching importance. They go much further than the immediate situation. They go also, it seems to me, to the matter of the much-discussed State compacts. If one State cannot regulate the amount of oil that flows in interstate commerce, can a group of States by compact regulate that amount? Can Congress consent to such regulation even before it is made or known?

Could one, or a group of oil-producing States, in some future time when oil runs short, limit its or their production to an amount sufficient only for their own citizens? It is easy to say that in such case Congress would repeal its interdiction so that oil might flow to the other States. But, in any event, we are dealing here with a supposed power of a State—with the aid of Congress—not only to conserve its petroleum but also to raise the price of petroleum and thus levy tribute upon the oil consumers of the Nation. (We assume that supply and demand still have some relationship to price!)

Perhaps no State would ever yield to that temptation. But we are dealing here with power, not policies; and questions of power, as Chief Justice Marshall once said, "Do not depend on the degree to which it may be exercised" (*Brown* v. *Maryland*, 12 Wheat. 419). And a century later Justice McKenna in Heisler against Thomas Colliery Co., Two Hundred and Sixtieth United States, page 245, said:

> The action of a State as a regulation of interstate commerce does not depend upon the degree of interference; it is illegal in any degree.

However ingenious we may be in our efforts to permit the States in effect, if not in law, to regulate interstate commerce in petroleum, we may yet find it necessary to amend the Constitution of the United States before that is done. We still have a Supreme Court, as we were reminded the other day.

Let us discuss some of the cases which point both ways—and the historical facts which led to the inclusion of the interstate-commerce clause in the Federal Constitution.

Why did the States in 1787 enter into that more perfect union under which we live? There were many reasons, of course, but according to Chief Justice Marshall:

> It may be doubted whether any of the evils proceeding from the feebleness of the Federal Government contributed more to that great revolution which introduced the present system than the deep and general conviction that commerce ought to be regulated by Congress—

Not by the States. Brown against Maryland. Marshall was a contemporary of the events of which he spoke. In *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1) Judge Johnson said:

> If there was any one object riding over every other in the adoption of the Constitution, it was to keep the commercial intercourse among the States free from all invidious and partial restraints.

Under the Confederation the restraints on the free flow of commerce among the Thirteen States were many and vexatious. Nearly every State erected tariff walls against its sisters. Each tried to build up its own economy at the expense of the others. And it may be doubted whether any factor has contributed as much toward building this Nation as the fact that commercial intercourse among the States has been kept free from restraints imposed by each State upon the others. As a result each State has not only had a free national market for its own goods but in turn has been able to buy what it cannot itself produce wherever it could buy cheapest. In other words, each State has had the benefit

of the low producing costs of the other States. This has constantly lowered the cost of goods to every American citizen and thus given a greater measure of general prosperity than any other nation ever achieved. All this is commonplace. One State grows cotton and buys wheat. Another makes automobiles and buys gasoline.

Now, when the States surrendered to the new Government under the Constitution the power which they previously held to regulate commerce, is it to be supposed that they intended the grantee of that power—Congress—to use it or permit it to be used by a sister State to build up its own industry—whether petroleum, coal, wheat, automobiles, or cotton—at the expense of the others? When a State gave up its power to exclude the goods of other States in exchange for a surrender by a sister State of a like power to exclude the goods of the first, can it be assumed that Congress was to prohibit what the States gave up the right to prohibit?

I know we are dealing here with a great and irreplaceable natural resource; but if the theory of Congressional acquiescence in State restrictions is sound in law, it must apply to all commodities.

The four or five automobile States could be equally permitted in law to limit the production of automobiles and thus raise the price and build up their economy at the expense of the rest. This would cause the other States to make their own automobiles—regardless of higher cost—and thus diminish the standards of living of the entire Nation.

To prevent such possibilities the States went to great lengths in writing the fundamental law of the Nation. They conferred upon Congress the exclusive power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States. They provided that no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State, that no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce—by the National Government—to the ports of one State over those of another, that no vessels bound to, or from, one State be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another, that all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States, that no State shall grant letters of marque and reprisal or without the consent of Congress lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, or lay any duty on tonnage, or enter into any agreement or compact with another State and that the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

It must be clear that it was the intention that all citizens and their property and business should be free and equal, so far as the law of the Union could make them so.

In *West* v. *Kansas Natural Gas Co.* (221 U. S. 229) it was held that a State could not prohibit the transportation outside the State of natural gas produced within the State. The Court said:

> If States have such power * * * Pennsylvania might keep its coal, the Northwest its timber, the mining States their minerals. And why not the products of the field be brought within the principle? * * * No State, by the exercise of, or by the refusal to exercise, any or all of its powers, may substantially discriminate against or directly regulate interstate commerce or the right to carry it on.

Similarly, in *Pennsylvania* v. *West Virginia* (262 U. S. 535), West Virginia passed a law to conserve to her own citizens her supply of natural gas which it was believed was being exhausted. The law was held unconstitutional as a State regulation of interstate commerce.

In two earlier cases a somewhat different view was taken. *Geer* v. *Connecticut* (161 U. S. 519) involved a statute forbidding shipment out of the State of wild game. It was upheld on the ground that wild game belongs to the State, which may confine the use of such game to those who own it, the people of the State. This was distinguished in West against Kansas on the ground that natural gas when reduced to possession becomes the property of the landowner—not of the State—and the subject of interstate commerce.

In *Hudson County Water Co.* v. *McCarter* (209 U. S. 349), it was held that New Jersey could prohibit the sale of water out of the State. This theory did not appeal to the court in the later cases involving natural gas.

These cases involve State restrictions on the outbound movement of commodities. The liquor cases, to which I shall refer, involve restrictions on inbound movement.

It may be said that West against Kansas and Pennsylvania against West Virginia did not have congressional sanction and that with it, the case might be different. This raises the question whether Congress can consent to a limitation on interstate commerce imposed by a State—at least as to commodities which do not run the gantlet of police power such as liquor. And with respect to the latter it may be pointed out that the prohibition extends uniformly to all liquor; not some liquor; in other words, to the commodity itself, not to the amount of the commodity.

Since the *Passenger Cases* (7 How. 282) it is generally accepted doctrine that the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce is "immediately exclusive"—that a State cannot regulate such commerce on the theory that, in any particular case, Congress by inaction or silence can be supposed to have given consent. This doctrine leads to the conclusion that the congressional power to regulate cannot be delegated to the States any more—let us say—than it could unconditionally delegate it to the President as was attempted in the Amazon-Panama cases.

In 1890 Congress passed the Wilson Act to subject intoxicating liquor to State law when brought within the State, though still in the original package. This was held constitutional in *Re Rohrer* (140 U. S. 545). The Court said:

> It does not admit of argument that Congress can neither delegate its own powers nor enlarge those of a State. * * * By the adoption of the Constitution the ability of the several States to act upon the matter solely in accordance with their own will was extinguished, and the legislative will of the general Government substituted. * * * In enacting the law in question Congress has not attempted to delegate the power to regulate commerce * * * or to grant a power not possessed by the States, or to adopt State laws. It has taken its own course and made its own regulation, applying to these subjects of interstate commerce one common rule, whose uniformity is not affected by variations in State laws in dealing with such property. * * * Congress did not use terms of permission to the State to act, but simply removed an impediment to the enforcement of the State laws in respect to imported packages in their original condition, created by the absence of a specific utterance on its part. It imparted no power to the State not then possessed, but allowed imported property to fall at once upon arrival within the local jurisdiction.

Before the Wilson Act was passed, two cases, *Bowman* v. *Railroad* (125 U. S. 465) and *Leisy* v. *Hardin* (135 U. S. 100), had held that the States could not forbid the import of liquor. In those cases there were expressions that Congress might grant express permission or allow the States to do so.

When it was found that the Wilson Act original packages were leaking, the Webb-Kenyon Act was passed, in 1913, over the veto of President Taft, who held it was an unconstitutional transfer of congressional power. The act was upheld in *Clark Distillery Co.* v. *Western Maryland Ry. Co.* (242 U. S. 311). The Court said:

> The sole claim is that the act was not within the power of Congress to regulate because it submitted liquors to the control of the States by subjecting interstate commerce in such liquor to present and future State prohibition, and hence in the nature of things was wanting in uniformity. * * * The argument as to delegation to the States rests upon a mere misconception. It is true the regulation which the Webb-Kenyon Act contains permits State prohibitions to apply to movements of liquor from one State to another, but the will which causes the prohibitions to be applicable is that of Congress, since the application of State prohibition would cease the instant the act of Congress ceased to apply.

It must, I think, be admitted that the language just quoted has some bearing upon the proposed redraft of section 9 (c). In distinction, however, it may be pointed out that in that case the State prohibition, as well as the auxiliary prohibition of Congress, was absolute and uniform as to the thing prohibited. It prohibited the commodity itself, not its amount. It interdicted an article, not a quantity. It did not sanction a part, and condemn another part of the same thing.

Whether this has legal significance I do not know. But in any event the Supreme Court was then dealing with a commodity—intoxicating liquor—as to which there was no question the State might prohibit in its entirety.

In the oleomargarine cases the courts have gone a long way to prevent commerce in an article that might be easily

and fraudulently palmed off as something that it is not. But in *Schallenberger* v. *Pennsylvania* (171 U. S. 1), the Court said: "A lawful article of commerce (oleomargarine) cannot be wholly excluded from importation into a State from another State where it is manufactured or grown."

This brings us to the question whether oil made hot by State law is a lawful article of commerce while admitting that what might be called cold oil is clearly lawful.

Here the analogy of the stolen automobile suggests itself. The Dyer Act punishing the transportation of stolen motor vehicles was upheld in *Brooks* v. *U. S.* (267 U. S. 432). The Court said:

> Congress can certainly regulate interstate commerce to the extent of forbidding and punishing the use of such commerce as an agency to promote immorality, dishonesty, or the spread of any evil or harm to the people of other States from the State of origin. In doing this it is merely exercising the police power, for the benefit of the public, within the field of interstate commerce.

The Court then discussed the cases involving diseased cattle, lottery tickets, prize-fight films, white slaves, adulterated articles, and so forth. In these cases the use of interstate commerce had contributed to the accomplishment of harmful results to the people of other States. The child-labor case, *Hammer* v. *Dagenhart* (247 U. S. 251), was described as "really not a regulation of interstate commerce but a congressional attempt to regulate labor in the State of origin, by an embargo on its external trade."

Is "hot oil" in the same category as a stolen automobile? Neither is harmful in itself, like a tubercular cow. The sale, however, of a stolen automobile in another State is a fraud upon the innocent purchaser. His money is obtained on a false pretense. He acquires no title to what he buys. "Hot oil", however, when it moves into another State either in its crude or refined form, is so incapable or difficult of identification as such that to deny a good title to its purchaser would place an almost insufferable burden upon commerce in petroleum. The question may therefore still be asked whether the movement of "hot oil" is apt to accomplish a harmful result to the people of other States than the State of origin. Neither the Connally or Disney redraft of 9 (c) goes so far as to forfeit the interest of the innocent purchaser. He, therefore, cannot receive a harmful result. The thing condemned by their drafts is transportation or commerce not purchase and use.

If Congress, under Hammer against Dagenhart, cannot regulate labor in the State of origin, can it directly or indirectly regulate production in the State of origin even though the State, like Barkis, is willing?

The *Champlin Refining Co.* v. *Corporation Commission of Oklahoma* (286 U. S. 210) did not hinge upon the interstate-commerce clause of the Federal Constitution.

The Court said, in upholding the State proration law, that it—

> Applies only to production and not to sales or transportation of crude oil or its products. Such production is essentially a mining operation and therefore is not a part of interstate commerce even though the product obtained is intended to be and in fact is immediately shipped in such commerce.

Heisler v. *Thomas Colliery Co.* (260 U. S. 245) is a case to which I have already referred. It is of very great interest not only as a sidelight on petroleum but with reference to other natural resources such as are now under consideration by Congress and the National Resources Board.

In that case Pennsylvania provided that anthracite but not bituminous coal should be "subject to a tax of 1½ percent of the value thereof when prepared for market." The attorneys general of the States of New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Delaware—anthracite-consuming States—filed briefs. It was alleged that Pennsylvania had a practical monopoly of anthracite coal, and that 80 percent of its production was shipped to other States, which constitute its major market.

It was therefore claimed that the imposition of this additional tax on anthracite alone would be passed on to the consumer and thus permit—

> The holder of a natural monopoly to use the channels of interstate commerce to tax persons in other States to the extent of about $6,000,000 a year, of which about $3,000,000 will be paid by the protesting States.
>
> Outward movement is as much within the protection of the commerce clause as inward movement. * * * If the tax be upheld, it is inevitable that every State which possesses natural resources essential to other States will impose similar taxes, in order to make those which it cannot directly and constitutionally tax contribute to its exchequer through the channels of commerce. Indeed, several States may combine (interstate oil compacts) so as to create absolute monopolies by the enactment of uniform laws exacting taxes similar to this. Such a situation would bring back the commercial conflicts between the States which the commerce clause was enacted to prevent.

Reliance was placed on cases holding void, as to documents used in interstate commerce, State stamp-tax laws—*United States* v. *Hroslef* (237 U. S. 1), and so forth.

The Court disposed of these contentions and held the act valid as not infringing on the power to regulate commerce or as a denial of due process as an unreasonable classification for tax purposes:

> A tax upon articles in one State that are destined for use in another State cannot be called a regulation of interstate commerce, whether imposed in the certainty of a return from a monopoly existing, or in the doubt and chances because of competition. The contention is—

Said the Court—

> that the products of a State that have, or are destined to have, a market in other States are subjects of interstate commerce, though they have not moved from the place of their production or preparation.

The Court held, rightly, it seems, that this drove the old gray mare too far. It said:

> The reach and consequences of the contention repel its acceptance. If the possibility, or, indeed, certainty of exportation of a produce or article from a State determines it to be in interstate commerce before the commencement of its movement from the State, it would seem to follow that it is in such commerce from the instant of its growth or production, and in the case of coals, as they lie in the ground. The result would be curious. It would nationalize all industries; it would nationalize and withdraw from State jurisdiction and deliver to Federal commercial control the fruits of California and the South, the wheat of the West and its meats, the cotton of the South, the shoes of Massachusetts, and the woolen industries of other States at the very inception of their production or growth; that is, the fruits unpicked, the cotton and wheat ungathered, hides and flesh of cattle yet on the hoof, wool yet unshorn, and coal yet unmined, because they are, in varying percentages, destined for and sure to be exported to States other than those of their production.

The Court concluded that the power of Pennsylvania to tax continued to, and ceased when commodities commenced their final movement for transportation from the State of their origin to that of their destination. The fact that the coal was to be taxed on its value when ready for shipment did not cause the situation of the coal to be changed and as moving in interstate commerce when it is plainly not so moving.

The obvious effort, however, of Pennsylvania to impose a tax on its consumers of anthracite in other States, while legally permissible, recalls an observation by Alexander Hamilton in Thirty-first Federalist:

> It should not be forgotten that a disposition in the State governments to encroach upon the rights of the Union is quite as probable as a disposition in the Union to encroach upon the rights of State governments.

This paper will justify the labor of its preparation if it recalls once more the wisdom of the fathers in making commerce among the States free from State control and the ever-present danger of whittling that wisdom away. We may, and do, freely grant the desirability of conserving a great natural resource while we at the same time recognize the temptation to use conservation as an excuse for stabilization, for building up profits in one State at the cost of the other States. Conservation is primarily a national problem, and danger may lie in Congress tying itself too tightly to a solution of that problem that is apt to be too greatly influenced by local and selfish considerations.

These observations are submitted to the Congress and the petroleum industry for their consideration in the hope that further discussion may clarify the questions involved.

Congressmen sometimes rush in where judges fear to tread.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I desire to call the attention of the House very briefly to important headlines carried in every metropolitan paper this morning. It seems to me this is a subject that is of equal importance and of equal interest to the majority as well as to the minority Members of the Congress. I can say that so far as I am concerned as a Member of this body, I was considerably disturbed. It seems to me this announcement materially affects the future of our present form of government and whether or not we are to continue to have three separate and distinct branches of Government, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial.

The immediate article to which I shall refer appeared in the New York Tribune, but practically the same matter was carried in all of the other morning papers:

Industry to tell views; new-deal open door to opinions of business is created by extension of Advisory Planning Council.

Now comes the direct quotation given by Secretary Roper which, I expect, has the approval of the administration. I quote:

Any business man or organization desiring to be heard on any piece of pending or proposed legislation may get a hearing through this council.

According to the present plan, and set-up, and policy of the Federal Government hearings on pending legislation for 150 years have been carried on before the committees having jurisdiction over that legislation. It seems to me that that is the proper forum for the business men of the country or any other man who has any suggestion relative to pending legislation to present his views. That is certainly the place unless we are going entirely to change our present procedure as far as legislative matters are concerned, and adopt in its place a complete form of government under commissions. This policy has always been opposed by both major political parties, and this announcement at this time from a high source in the present administration indicates to me that the administration intends to further take unto itself all the constitutional rights of the legislative branch of the Government.

Further quoting:

Information and suggestions communicated to it will be passed along to the subcommittee for consideration and later communicated to different Members of the Cabinet. They, in turn, will route the suggestions through whatever channels they deem fit.

Now, it seems to me that that is a definite statement that as far as this supercommission is concerned they do not intend to give any consideration whatever to the legislative branch of the Government. They mention the Cabinet, a part of the executive, but do not even mention the legislative. Therefore, what other deduction can we make from that statement except Congress will be ignored more fully in the future than this administration is doing at present?

I am wondering how the elected Members of the majority look on such an astounding suggestion from the executive branch of the Government?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I wish the gentleman would wait just a minute.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I should like to ask the gentleman a question on that particular point.

Mr. SNELL. What is the question?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Is there anything in the statement made by the Secretary that precludes any committee of Congress from considering legislation that may come before such committee?

Mr. SNELL. The statement is made definitely to the effect that they will put it wherever they see fit and indicates it will be referred to one of its own subcommittees, or to the Cabinet, but no mention whatever of the legislative branch, which is created under the Constitution for the express purpose of legislating. I maintain, if you are going to carry out that idea and we are going to have supercommission government, the American House of Representatives and Senate have no further functions to perform. I have nothing to criticize as far as the members of that commission are concerned. They are all high-grade men; but if they are going to decide the policies of this Government in regard to all legislative matters, I maintain they should be elected to the House of Representatives or to the Senate from their individual districts and then they will have the opportunity of doing that work. [Applause.]

I expect to make some further remarks later and speak more fully along this line, but I want to say here and now that so far as I am concerned the continued supercommission form of government is not going to go unchallenged. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I agree in part with what the gentleman says. Of course, he is reading from the mouthpiece of the opposition.

Mr. SNELL. Regardless of the paper, I read a direct quotation supposed to come from Secretary of Commerce Roper.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not like to see the minority leader get so alarmed about the fear that Congress is ever going to delegate to anybody its legislative power.

Mr. SNELL. May I say that if you continue along the line you have gone the last 2 years, you will not have to go very much farther before you have delegated all of the power. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is a criticism that is always used by the opposition. It was used during the 8 years the gentleman's party was in control.

Mr. SNELL. I am not going to yield to the gentleman in order to make a long speech. If we went as far as the present administration, or even ever suggested going as far as your administration is now going, I want to apologize now. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have never acquired the habit of putting my own speeches in the RECORD, but it is just a coincidence that last evening I spoke before the Bar Association of Baltimore County on the very same subject the distinguished minority leader has discussed.

During the 10 years I served under the Republican administration, and it was very much under, I heard no complaint from the Republican side as to the great menace of "delegation of congressional power", and I recall many a day when all the Republican leaders of the House spent their time at the other end of the avenue or in some department getting ideas as to legislation. They had no objection then. They were going down town every day in order to get ideas as to what should be passed here, and may I say further that there never was a party in power that brought in here so much legislation and passed it under the suspension of the rules as the Republican Party did when they were in power.

Now, I do not mind the opposition press criticising Congress for relinquishing its rights. I expect that from the New York Herald Tribune and the Chicago Tribune, I expect it from the minority, but I know that the public today has

confidence in the Democratic Congress. They know their Members are sent here direct from the people and that there is no danger that the fundamental conceptions of our Government are going to pass out of existence. One hundred and fifty years from now we will still have a Congress of the United States functioning here and passing legislation, and no executive or any other branch is going to interfere.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows that the minority leader's last President for 4 years never had an idea of his own. He never had a constructive policy of his own. He never had a program of his own. He left everything to commissions, and every time he wanted to do something he appointed a commission and spent a year or 18 months investigating before his commission would give him an idea.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What annoys some Members of the minority is that for 8 years in the White House they built up a reputation of complete silence. That was their only claim to fame—Silent Cal and Silence. Now we have a man in the White House who is brave enough to speak up and talk with his own American people who elected him, and the Republicans just cannot understand how that could possibly happen. Whenever the distinguished President transmits to Congress some ideas for the consideration of the Congress that is such a new venture, such a novelty to the minority that they talk about dictatorship. This is contrasted with the silent men that they had down there. If they had not been so silent, we would not be in the position we are today, because it was their silence for 4 or 5 years that threw us into the greatest abyss that any nation has ever been in, so we are not worried about this minority attack in reference to legislation being perfected somewhere else.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] stirred up a tempest in a teapot about nothing. The various departments investigating these matters which business men have brought to them have nothing to do with committee hearings on proposed legislation. No matter what these department heads may do, and no matter to whom these things may be referred, any legislation, before it can come to the floor of this House, must go to a committee, and if the committee desires to do so it may hold hearings on the proposition.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly.

Mr. RANKIN. I am surprised at my friend the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. It is all right to laugh about it, but the statement is definitely made, "If the people want to have any expression or present their ideas on pending legislation", and so forth. I claim that if they want to present their ideas on pending legislation they should go before the appropriate committee of the Congress, as has always been done.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, the gentleman from New York knows that that is just what they have got to do.

Mr. SNELL. I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is exactly the point I made.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Some of the Members who have been here for years will recall that when important legislation was before this House, especially that which came from other sources, we had three or four Presidential secretaries and Cabinet members on the floor here to see that such legislation went through. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous vote of the Committee on Labor, I have been instructed to come before the House and to protest to the Speaker and the Membership of this House against the referring of legislation to the Ways and Means Committee which properly belongs in the Committee on Labor.

For the past 12 years the Committee on Labor has held long, extensive hearings on old-age pension legislation. During the past 3 years the Committee on Labor has held hearings on unemployment insurance and the Committee feels, with no aspersion cast on the Ways and Means Committee, that all the brains of the House of Representatives are not necessarily confined to the Ways and Means Committee, and the members of the Committee on Labor feel that legislation affecting labor and the employees in labor in the United States should be referred to the Committee on Labor, where it properly belongs.

I have here the Lewis bill and I understand the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. DOUGHTON, has the same bill, and the title of the bill is "To alleviate the hazards of old age, unemployment, illness, and dependency; to establish a social insurance board in the Department of Labor; to raise revenue, and for other purposes."

The only thing in this entire title which sends this bill to the Ways and Means Committee is the phrase "to raise revenue."

Now, as I say, I have no desire to cast any aspersions on the Ways and Means Committee. They are all fine Members, intelligent, bright Members of the House of Representatives, but I do feel it is my duty as Chairman of the Committee on Labor to protest that after a committee has worked for 12 years on legislation that it is almost an insult to that committee to have such legislation referred to another committee at the last minute.

What applies to the Committee on Labor applies equally to other committees of the House, and I am doing this by direction of my committee and, as I say, by the unanimous vote of the committee.

I do not think it is just to the committee to work long days, many times well into the night, on legislation for the benefit of the American people and then at the last minute have it referred to another committee and have that committee obtain all the credit for 12 years of work on the part of the Committee on Labor.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. I feel that the gentleman from Massachusetts should not be too severe upon the Speaker who made the reference, due to the fact that the reference was made in conformity with the rules of the House. The rules of the House specifically give exclusive jurisdiction to the Committee on Ways and Means of any bill relating to the raising of revenue.

Mr. CONNERY. I understand that, but what the Committee on Labor wants is a bill to come in here that will not necessarily send it to the Ways and Means Committee. Divide your bill up and put the legislation where it belongs and not have the Ways and Means Committee running all the affairs of the Nation. Let us have the committees function properly or let us abolish them.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts knows there is no disposition on my part to quarrel with him about this question.

Mr. CONNERY. I know that.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. But I invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Speaker did not make this reference. By unanimous vote of the House this message and the accompanying legislation was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CONNERY. I understand that thoroughly, and, of course, the gentleman knows, as a practical matter, how much good it would have done me to stand up here yesterday and move that the matter be referred to the Committee on Labor.

Mr. COOPER of Tennessee. I simply invite the attention of the gentleman, as well as the House, to the fact that the House voted unanimously in making this reference.

Mr. CONNERY. We ask that the various portions of these bills be referred to the appropriate committees, and not put unemployment insurance and old-age pensions, which are directly connected with the workers of the United States, in

the Ways and Means Committee by putting in the words " to raise revenue."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is there anything to prevent the gentleman's committee from reporting favorably his bill to the House?

Mr. CONNERY. No.

Mr. SABATH. Why does not the gentleman do that?

Mr. CONNERY. Because we have been through that. We reported an old-age pension bill last year, which is exactly in line with what the President asked yesterday in his message and we could not get a rule from the Rules Committee.

Mr. SABATH. You would not need any rule.

Mr. CONNERY. When we have studied legislation which the President wants, do not wait until you can send it to the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SABATH. This would not delay the reporting of a bill by the gentleman's committee. The committee has plenty of time now.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I have performed my duty as requested by the committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ACOUSTICS OF THE HALL OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

IMPROVEMENT OF AUDITION IN THE HOUSE CHAMBER

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for about 5 minutes. I ask the indulgence of Members of the House to listen to me for just a few moments on a question which has been of great interest to many of the new Members, something which I have discussed with many Members on both sides of the House, and which pertains to the bad acoustical conditions which exist here. People who have been in the House for many years agree that these conditions exist, and they agree that an improvement can be made. Many plans have been suggested. I am opposed to anything which would in any way change the appearance of this historical Chamber. My present interest is the comfort of Members of the House in order that they can more easily hear what is going on.

Being the only practical radio announcer in the House today, I became interested, and have made a 3 weeks' study of the acoustical properties of the House, and from personal investigation, personal contact with the Members, employees, and visitors, I find that we are not taking advantage of modern equipment which would bring invaluable improvements and more comfort, which would make us more efficient in our service to the people, aid our esteemed Speaker, lend more dignity to this body, and render more humane treatment to our speakers and employees, who today must yell at the tops of their voices the words in important documents, punctuated by the hammering of the Speaker's gavel, in order that we may hear.

I have talked to many Congressmen and asked them why it is when an important document is being read, when a Member is delivering an address on a matter of vital importance, there is so much confusion, so much noise, so much talking, and why Members congregate in the aisles and passageways and talk. The reply that comes to me is that they cannot hear anyway, and that they will be able to read what is going on in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or in the newspapers. It is my belief that this is all unnecessary, especially with the great strides science has made in the loud-speaking equipment, and it is my belief and the belief of many who are here fresh from their campaigns in which they talked to thousands of people, that we should avail ourselves of this new humane comfort for the good of the Nation.

I could easily demonstrate on the floor of this House the ease with which this question can be solved by speaking in a natural tone, which you could never hear without a loud speaker, and then imitating the efforts of some of our Members in endeavoring to speak loudly. There are only a few men in the House today, from my observation, who are able to talk loud enough to be fully heard.

With this new speaking equipment in the House, the Speaker could control the House more easily. A microphone at the Speaker's desk, one at the Clerks' desk, one, each, at the reading tables, with invisible loud speakers installed at various places in the House, with the wiring placed in conduits under the floor and space provided for same, would correct the condition which exists here today. I am not endeavoring to give you a salesmanship talk on equipment. My remarks to the House are the result of deep study in acoustics and present conditions in the House, to which I have devoted many hours, and are the result of a conference with officials who agree with me. For instance, the President, in person, delivered an important message to us the other day. It was impossible to hear all that the President had to say, and we Members of the House had to wait for copies of the address before we were able to understand what the President was saying. On the other hand, three radio chains, the National Broadcasting Co., the Columbia Broadcasting System, and the American Broadcasting System, had their equipment installed in the House and enabled people miles away from lines of communication, without telephones, miles away from railroads, to hear every word distinctly, while we who sat here in the presence of the President, hearing his voice, seeing him in person, were unable to hear what he said.

The same thing is true with some of the great speakers who stand before us and talk on great state matters. We who are new are amazed to learn that we must sit very close to the speaker if we wish to hear what he has to say. It is not a question of defective hearing. It is a question of acoustical conditions in the Chamber and a condition which can be easily rectified by taking advantage of modern equipment.

My address here today is the result of a conference with Dave Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, and conference with the Honorable JOE BYRNS, the Speaker of the House, who realize that improvements can be made and who are glad to cooperate. It is my belief that the Architect should be given permission to make such experiments looking toward this necessary improvement.

This address is also the result of a conference with experienced radio experts of this city and the publishers of the magazine Broadcasting, who realize these conditions and who wonder why something has not been done about it. It is my belief that if these improvements were made it would be of inestimable value to our Speaker, making it easier for him to be heard and to more easily carry out the programs which have been laid down. It is also the result of conferences with Members who realize the good psychological effect this would have on the entire House, and that it would result in humane treatment to Members who come here to represent their people and who are anxious to be given all of the information that they need, and who are entitled to hear what is being said.

This House Chamber is approximately 75 years old. I join in the sentiment of Members of the House that nothing should be done to mar any historical phase of this Chamber. I am also in accord with the argument that nothing should be done in any way to mar architecturally or structurally or otherwise deface the present beauty of the House Chamber. The plan I have in mind will not do this but will merely mean the installation of appropriate equipment that will make it possible for human ears to hear what is being said.

I have been asked by various Members on both sides of the aisle whether or not the plan I have in mind will make it possible for those gentlemen in the press gallery to hear the proceedings on the floor without having to strain their ears, as they have to do now, and I have answered that that benefit would result.

While we must preserve the beauty of the artists who designed this historical Chamber 75 years ago, we must bear

in mind the rapidity of the development of modern science, and, wherever it is possible, we must take advantage of modern mechanical equipment, especially when it will be of direct benefit to the people whose interests we serve.

Because I feel the great service this would render to the Government, to the House, and to the people, I plead with Members to give the Architect permission to make such experiments which would lead to the installation of improvements in this historical Chamber, in no way marring its present beauty or its historical aspects; and so, Mr. Speaker, looking toward this greatly needed improvement, I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk and ask the Clerk to read:

The Clerk read the following resolution:

Whereas it is the common experience of Members of the House of Representatives that their participation in the proceedings of the House and the transaction of the public business are hindered and made unduly difficult because of imperfect audition in the House Chamber; and

Whereas it is certain that the conveyance of sound in the Chamber can be greatly improved by mechanical means: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized and directed to thoroughly investigate the means of such improvement and as promptly as practicable to report to the House of Representatives the results of such investigation, his recommendations calculated to perfect the conveyance of sound in the Chamber; and the estimated cost of making such improvement.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. McSWAIN. Could a loud speaker be installed in the Press Gallery so that those gentlemen there would not have to strain their ears, as they do now, to hear the proceedings on the floor?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; it can be done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed resolution to which the gentleman from Nebraska refers be read from the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution

Whereas it is the common experience of Members of the House of Representatives that their participation in the proceedings of the House and the transaction of the public business are hindered and made unduly difficult because of imperfect audition in the House Chamber; and

Whereas it is certain that sound conveyance in the Chamber can be greatly improved by mechanical means: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized and directed to thoroughly investigate the means of such improvement and as promptly as practicable to report to the House of Representatives the results of such investigation; his recommendations calculated to perfect sound conveyance in the Chamber; and the estimated cost of making such improvement.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk has just read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, we have an important appropriation bill under consideration, which must be read and passed today; hence, on behalf of the chairman of our committee, I feel I must object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ELECTION TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 60

Resolved, That WILLIAM M. CITRON, of Connecticut, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

ACOUSTICS OF THE HALL OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one moment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the only reason that I shall speak at this moment is the fact that I, too, am a new Member. I was intensely interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] who submitted the resolution regarding the acoustics of this room. Those of you distinguished gentlemen who have been here serving your country for many years have ceased, perhaps, to notice the difficulty with which we hear. I come here with all of the impressions that accompany every new Member of this House. I have talked to many of the new Members themselves, and they all agree with me that it would add tremendously to the respect that the public in general gives this House if we could be heard when we speak.

The President of the United States addressed this body at the beginning of this session. The magic charm of his personality, the melody of his splendid speaking voice, the intense interest of those who listened gave him a hearing that no one else could have obtained in this Chamber, crowded as it was, and yet by reason of poor acoustics you and I who sat in the back of this Chamber could not hear him. There were hundreds of citizens of the United States in these galleries, and they could not hear him. Every day that I have been here there have been many hundreds of people in the galleries from all over the United States. We are their servants, and they have a right to hear the proceedings of the House. I have talked with quite a number of them, and some of them go away with the impression that no Member of Congress can get a respectful hearing in this body. I am simply giving you the impressions of people with whom I have talked. I think it would be of great advantage to the Members of the House and of great advantage to the people of the United States if the resolution regarding the study of the acoustics of this Chamber could be given serious study by this body. [Applause.]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia, and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, with Mr. GREENWOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

For personal services of administrative and supervisory officers, in accordance with the act fixing and regulating the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, approved June 4, 1924 (43 Stat., pp. 367–375), including salaries of presidents of teachers colleges in the salary schedule for first assistant superintendents, $661,800.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DITTER: On page 30, line 23, after the word "superintendents", strike out "$661,800" and insert in lieu thereof "$666,100."

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the Clerk just read relates to the character-education program about which I spoke at some length yesterday. The increase provides for the payment of an assistant superintendent at $4,300.

The item of character education has been endorsed by the superintendent of schools. He has definitely requested that the experiments which we started a year ago might be continued. I feel confident that the members of the subcommittee have confidence in Dr. Ballou's judgment. I believe that they have confidence in the way in which he has administered the schools of the District of Columbia. The suggestion has been made that this character-education program could be carried on by giving the work of character education over to the group of teachers and associates presently employed as regular teachers. Dr. Ballou is an expert in education. He commands the respect of educators not only of the District but of the whole country. I believe this body should follow his suggestions so long as they come within reasonable bounds, and it is my conviction that this is reasonable.

The argument may be made that our taxpayers back home are going to pay for this program of character education. Let me remind the members of the committee that a very considerable portion of the total cost comes from the taxpayers of the District of Columbia. In other words, the spread is about 6 to 1. This entire character-education program will cost approximately $85,000.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield.

Mr. COX. I have always been under the impression that all education was character improving in its nature. What is the distinction? Frankly, I do not know.

Mr. DITTER. The purpose of the program as inaugurated last year in the District of Columbia was to study intensely child psychology and child physiology in order that those defects which under ordinary educational processes might be latent could be discovered, and corrective measures brought in order that those defects might be cured.

Mr. COX. In other words, is it work that the regular organization could not well do?

Mr. DITTER. It is the conviction and the stated opinion of Dr. Ballou that the work cannot be carried on by the regularly assigned group of teachers.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The present amendment which the gentleman has offered is one of four which our friend intends to offer to this bill, if he is successful on this one? This one carries $4,300. The next one will carry $5,000; the third one will carry $20,340; and the next one $56,900. Then there is another one of $1,000, and if the gentleman is successful, when he gets through he will have added $87,540 to this bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. DITTER. I did not yield for a statement, but I yielded for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. Is that not correct?

Mr. DITTER. But may I say to the gentleman from Texas that I have already anticipated his alarmist attitude and have stated to the House that the program comprehended the possible expenditure of $85,000. So I anticipated this alarmist attitude that the gentleman from Texas is presently trying to impress upon the House. I purpose in no sense to leave the House under any misapprehension. The educational program which I purpose bringing to the floor this morning provides ultimately, in this present appropriation bill, for approximately $85,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit me, then, the gentleman's program, if he is successful in getting this amendment passed, is to add these other items aggregating an additional $85,000.

Mr. DITTER. I have already handed to the desk, to be read at the proper time, amendments to provide for approximately $85,000, which comes within the Budget estimate.

Mr. BLANTON. That is correct, then?

Mr. DITTER. It comes within the amount which the Bureau of the Budget submitted.

Now, may I proceed, after the effort at alarming the Membership of this House by the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

I have the highest regard for my friend from Texas. I have regard for his continued and persistent effort to watch the expenditures of government. I believe he is the watchdog of the Treasury; but I believe that, only too often, the gentleman does not have a proper sense of relative values. I believe the gentleman is willing to see a considerable sum spent for some pet project of his, and absolutely ignore the demands of the school children, not only of the District of Columbia, but the school children of the country, for, mark you, this is experimental in its character. I confess that.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DITTER. In just a moment. If this experiment, as a result of 3 years of continued effort, proves successful, then the school children of your district and the school children of every district in this country may benefit by the advanced program, such as has been inaugurated in the District of Columbia.

I now yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Does my good friend from Pennsylvania mean to intimate to this House that the mere statement of any program he would propose here would be alarming to the House?

Mr. DITTER. No. I am afraid that my——

Mr. BLANTON. That is what the gentleman intimated, that a mere statement of his program would alarm the House.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the gentleman from Texas has misunderstood my statement. I know the distinguished gentleman from Texas tries to alarm the House about possible expenditures——

Mr. BLANTON. By stating the actual facts that appear in the record.

Mr. DITTER. Which I had already previously stated to the House. Now, again, with that interruption out of the way, irrespective of party lines—and there is no partisanship in this—if you believe that the children of the District should have the advantages of psychological and physical tests that are comprehended in this program, should have the benefit of trained assistants in studying the defects that are there, latent in many instances, and the benefit of corrective measures to cure these defects, you will support this amendment and the other amendments I purpose offering for character education. Only too frequently the school programs have been hit-or-miss programs. This is an advanced program of benefit such as has been endorsed by an educator in whom every Member of this House should have confidence.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DITTER. I shall be pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. COX. Would the adoption of the other amendments, to which reference has been made, be necessary to make effective the amendment now pending?

Mr. DITTER. I believe they all hang together. I see no reason for asking for the appointment of a superintendent at $4,300 unless he has a complement of personnel in that particular division to carry out the program under his

direction. If you are not in favor of the whole program, then we should certainly vote down this $4,300 request. The requests which will follow have to do with the appointment of councilors and the appointment of teachers to build up and continue the present personnel and to extend the program into the other schools.

I ask your support for the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee chairman has asked me to act for him in opposing this amendment. I do not believe any schools anywhere in the United States, or even in the world, have been treated better than have the schools in Washington. We have furnished the 91,241 school children of Washington some of the finest buildings, some of the finest equipment, some of the best teachers, who have been paid the highest salaries, and who have been given more privileges and advantages than I believe exist in any other school in the country.

The superintendent of schools in Washington is paid a salary of $10,000 a year, but in Yale, in Harvard, in Columbia, in Cornell, in Princeton, in the University of Chicago there are full professorships which do not carry any such salary. If you look on page 448 of the hearings you will find that there are 136 of the Washington high-school teachers who get $3,200 a year and that there are 488 high-school teachers here who receive salaries of $2,800 a year.

At the hearings evidence was adduced showing a man who had been president of a first-class university for 26 years had during the depression taken as low as $2,700 a year and then has had to wait for his money, as shown on page 795 of the printed hearings. Not a teacher in the schools of Washington—and there are about 2,900 teachers here—has ever had to wait 1 hour for salary, and they have gotten their salaries the very minute they were due in spot cash.

I do not believe you will find a man in the United States who knows more about the school situation in Washington or the general affairs of Washington than the splendid and able chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. He has studied the situation for years intimately and in detail.

This $85,000 item was not in the bill last year when it passed the House. It is a new idea. The bill passed the House and went to the Senate. There it was amended by a distinguished Senator, who placed this item in the bill, and upon his insistence in conference the committee allowed it to remain, as an experiment.

They made no attempt to put character education in all the schools here. They picked out 10 schools with 5,575 pupils. Remember, the total number of pupils in the Washington schools is 91,241.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Hence, even after spending this $85,000, there were 85,666 students, pupils in the Washington schools, who did not have any contact or benefit from it whatever. It was an experiment. It was tried on only 5,575 pupils in 10 schools and they were the only ones who had any benefit from it. They were 85,666 pupils who were left out in the cold.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman from Texas tell us what opinion was expressed by Dr. Ballou?

Mr. BLANTON. Dr. Ballou, of course, was in favor of it. It meant having $85,000 additional to spend.

Mr. DITTER. I am speaking of the present opinion of Dr. Ballou in regard to the continuance of this particular program.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, Dr. Ballou is in favor of having an additional $85,000 to spend; he was in favor of the subject.

Mr. DITTER. The distinguished gentleman from Texas has commented upon Dr. Ballou's salary. Does he mean to infer that he has not confidence in Dr. Ballou's ability?

Mr. BLANTON. I have confidence in his ability. But I can get Ph. D. graduates from Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Columbia, Cornell, or the University of Chicago who are just as able and who will furnish just as good service to the schools of this city for a salary of much less than the $10,000 Dr. Ballou is getting, and they would be glad to receive such a salary.

Mr. DITTER. Just one further question.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. Please do not take up all of my time.

Mr. DITTER. Has the gentleman, with his usual energy, enthusiasm, and application to work, taken any steps toward securing the dismissal of Dr. Ballou and the substitution of one of these many, many applicants in whom he is personally interested?

Mr. BLANTON. No; certainly not. Our committee can not change the law. If we moved another one in he would get the same $10,000 a year, because the law provides that salary.

Mr. DITTER. Then, the gentleman is satisfied that Dr. Ballou should continue?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. He is about as good as any other we could get. And he is experienced here.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman has confidence in his judgment?

Mr. BLANTON. He is as good as anyone else we could get, but I think he is overpaid.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. This is just one of the ways of proving again the fact that when we establish one of these bureaus or departments, they want all they can get?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. Dr. Ballou wants this $85,000 to spend. It is easy to start a little bureau, and the first thing you know it has a thousand employees if Congress will provide the money to pay their salaries.

The distinguished chairman of this committee, Mr. CANNON, has passed on this matter. I hope he will be upheld.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The hearings of the committee disclose that when this subject was under consideration, my good friend from Pennsylvania asked no questions about it, offered no objections or suggestions, and apparently was not interested in the matter. If he had suggested this ought to go into the bill, we would have taken it under consideration and reached some agreement with him.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. The chairman of the subcommittee will probably recall that I reserved the right at the time the bill was being marked up with respect to the matter of character education, for my committee imprint definitely discloses that I made a memorandum of the right which I then reserved. However, let us brush aside technicalities, let us save the time of the House; let us save the time of the country and have my distinguished chairman agree to the amendment and we will go on our way without any further difficulty.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman had made that suggestion to me in committee, we could have determined it in committee.

Mr. DITTER. But can we not do it now?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. He made no suggestion whatever in the committee. We came to this item in marking up

the bill and I said to the committee, "What is the will of the committee with respect to this item?" I first called on Judge BLANTON, who said he thought it ought to be stricken. I then turned to Mr. DITTER, who was the leader of the minority, and asked if it would be agreeable with him if it was stricken out, and he said, "Yes; but I reserve the right to offer an amendment on the floor", and I said, "Is it all right to strike it out?" and he said, "Yes." That was the time to have made any proposition about retaining it, and we would have saved 1 day in this House. We would not have had this bill up in the House today. We could have taken up other pressing legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. And when the chairman discussed the matter with some very reliable teachers the gentleman from Texas was present.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. He was present and approved it. I may add that none of the teachers who appeared before us approved this expenditure. None of the representatives of parent-teachers associations who appeared before the committee, representing the parents of the pupils, favored it. All criticized it.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. If I had insisted upon it in committee and if the gentleman would have agreed to the inclusion of the item in the bill, why not agree to it now and close the discussion?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Why did not the gentleman suggest it then. We are appropriating for the schools of the District the greatest amount of money ever appropriated for the maintenance and operation of the schools in the history of the District. We are appropriating more money for the operation and maintenance of the schools of the District of Columbia per capita than is provided by any other city in the United States, and this amendment proposes to add $87,500 more for a purpose which both teachers and parents disapprove.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. There was some evidence about the boys and girls having to sign a questionnaire.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The teachers testified that the number of questionnaires and reports had greatly added to the burden of their work, without corresponding benefit to the pupils; that it was apparently an attempt to delegate to the school a function which properly belongs to the home and the church.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is one of the most amazing things that the English language is so flexible that one can discuss the issue without going to the substance or merits of the amendment proposed in this case.

There has been a change in education as there has been a change in everything else. They spent $2,500 for tallow candles when George Washington was inaugurated, and I suppose the electric-light bill would not be more than ten or fifteen dollars for the ball at the inauguration of President Roosevelt. There has been a change in industry, a change in science, and a change in education.

We cannot be content with the three R's that we once had. The science of pedagogy has changed in like degree.

I am amazed that my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Texas should be opposed to this amendment for this reason: The other day he read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from a Hearst paper which dealt with communism in this country. Communism is nothing more than the development of antisocial tendencies. What do they seek to do in character education. They seek to conserve in the children those qualities and opinions that will help to eliminate this antisocial tendency and make them better citizens. To talk about the salaries of school teachers completely begs the question and does not go to the merits of it. It is rather picayunish. Why, we used to pay the bricklayer $16 a day to build the foundation of a house. Then why kick about $300-a-month salaries for competent teachers to build the foundation of the lives of our children who will be the citizens of tomorrow?

Why drag a herring across the trail by talking about $3,200-a-year teachers, and all that sort of thing? The evidence will show that the average age of most of our criminals today is 23. Most of them are in the brackets from 18 to 19. So you see that crime, that antisocial conduct, starts early in life. This is an experiment in education seeking to deal with the conduct of children, seeking to give direction to these tendencies, so that we can get rid of the Capones and the Dillingers, and those who have been a menace to every fabric of our society.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. What are the parents supposed to do about this matter of character? Do we propose to delegate to the State everything, including the making of character?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Wisconsin knows very well that this is supplementary to the work of the home and supplementary to the work of the church.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Is not the whole effort of this new theory of education to delegate all of these things that the parents should do to the State? This is simply an evidence of that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is nothing more than an experiment to develop the right kind of character and conduct tendencies for healthier citizenship in this country.

Mr. O'MALLEY. But where do the parents come in?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is an expenditure and experiment similar to what you would have in the Department of Commerce if they asked for $250,000 to carry on experimentation to make airplane travel safer in this country. This goes to the vitals of future citizenship, and we should not be so picayunish as to consider the matter in terms of $87,000. It is money well spent. I venture to say that the Department of Justice expended $100,000 to just chase Dillinger around the country. If we correct the tendencies in a single child that might go into the paths of error and become a social enemy, this money would be well expended. Are you going to stop experimental work in education because there seems to be something abstract and elusive about it? Do not you think we have to carry on experiments in the psychology of pedagogy as well as we do in commerce and industry and science and in all those other things that lie on the doorstep of the Government? It is money well expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for 5 minutes. I want to ask him some questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I now yield to the distinguished statesman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. My friend heard the chairman of the committee say that when these teachers asked their superior what they should do about this character education, they were told to make talks to the children. They asked what kind of talks, and they were told: "Oh, you know how to talk to the children; go on and talk to them." Each teacher could prepare his own talk.

We have 2,900 teachers in the city of Washington. Complaints during the last 18 years have come to us that some of them are off color—are communistic in their tendencies.

If the character education permits each one of the 2,900 teachers to talk to the children as each wants to talk to them, how would character be built in the schools?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman be so kind as to inform us how many Communists we have on the teaching staff?

Mr. BLANTON. In the last 18 years I have received several complaints.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How many? Let us be specific.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand that one of the teachers was suspended here once. The teacher then appealed to the American Federation of Labor and the teachers' union, and that organization forced the teaching staff to restore the teacher; and restore the salary. There have been several complaints here during the last 18 years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Several complaints among 2,900 teachers over a period of 18 years! You will find that condition prevails in every city of this size in the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. After all, there should be character teaching in the make-up of every teacher. Is not that so? Every teacher everywhere, in every school, should do his part in character building.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Quite so.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. To answer the gentleman from Texas with regard to the communistic tendencies in the schools. With this character-education program under direct supervision, such as is provided for by Dr. Ballou, it will help root out the things that the gentleman from Texas complains about.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman knows and I know that these new-fangled ideas in education like this so-called "character education" are a lot of highbrow baloney to create some jobs for some people who are not working. Does the gentleman not think that the money might be better spent on the parents, whose duty it is to build character in their children?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the gentleman like to go back to the dim, misty day, when we had only the three R's and do away with the advantages accruing from modern education?

Mr. O'MALLEY. The gentleman misunderstands me. All these new theories in the last 10 years have not decreased crime, and all this trick education, this character education, has not seemed to decrease the crime rate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, the gentleman does not take into account the thousands of other factors that might enter into it. This is one of the major things to which we have given no attention before, and the gentleman knows that the crime rate has been on the increase all these years. Here is a chance for experiment in correctional methods.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What is the tax rate in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is $1.50 a hundred.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And what is the tax rate in the gentleman's community?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suppose about $3.50.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is twice the amount here?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, let me explain to the gentleman.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Does not the gentleman think the people in the District of Columbia ought to have some civic pride themselves, and raise this money?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is not informed. The tax rate in the District of Columbia is $1.50, but that is on the full valuation. When you come to pay taxes in New York you pay on the assessed basis, which is about one-half the value.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have the lowest tax rate of any city in the United States, but throughout the country they pay $3.50 or $4.20 a hundred, and in the District of Columbia they only pay $1.50.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is on the full amount.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They should have some civic pride and raise this money themselves.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it is a rank injustice to the people of the District of Columbia to constantly parade this information that the tax rate in the District of Columbia is $1.50, when, as a matter of fact, on the basis on which you are assessed in your State, and in mine, it would be $3 per hundred and not $1.50.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That would not be so in our city.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman make the observation for the benefit of the committee that the matter of the tax rate is not pertinent to the issue presently before the committee?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. DITTER. That of every dollar paid by the Federal Government $6 is matched by the taxpayers, and out of this present sum of $87,000, $6 of every $7 will be paid by the taxpayers of the District of Columbia and not by the people back home.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois does not want to misstate the facts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, indeed.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman's premise were correct, that the assessments were on full valuation, say, up to last year, and I do not agree with the gentleman, does not the gentleman know that in the hearings the Commissioners testified that in the last year they arbitrarily reduced the assessed values $80,000,000 and that again this year they reduced them arbitrarily $50,000,000; so that in the last 2 years they have arbitrarily reduced the assessed values $130,000,000 in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why should they not?

Mr. BLANTON. Then the assessments are at least $130,000,000 below full valuation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has again expired.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why should there not be a decrease in the assessable amount of property? Did not the gentleman from Texas take extreme pride in coming in to the Well of this House and helping the people of the District to constantly get those reductions?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I am the best friend that the Washington people have, in spite of the opposition of the newspapers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that is true. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. TRUAX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield for a brief question only. I wish to use some of my time myself.

Mr. TRUAX. I am going to ask for a little time unless the gentleman answers my question. I should like to ask the gentleman and his fellow character educationists if they receive their major support from their constituents on account of the appropriations they receive for the District of Columbia or for their own representative districts?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, now let me say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX] that of the thirty-eight or thirty-nine million dollars that is represented here only $5,700,000 comes out of the Federal Treasury. Is that not right?

Mr. BLANTON. That is just one item, but look at Howard University. Every dollar that is spent on Howard Uni-

versity is spent by the Federal Government. Look at some of the hospitals here, which benefit the District people, the money for which is furnished by the Federal Government out of other bills.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That has nothing to do with the bill under consideration.

Mr. BLANTON. I can tell the gentleman 20 different projects in the District of Columbia benefiting Washington people alone that the Federal Government finances in other departmental bills.

Mr. TRUAX. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not at this time. Here they are paying taxes out of their own pocket, to which Uncle Sam adds $5,700,000. What for? For all this real estate that has been displaced and that is not taxable, because it is a part of the instrumentality of government. Look at the majestic buildings and the vast amount of land preempted by Uncle Sam from which the District derives no taxes. That is why we throw a lump sum into this appropriation bill. Most of it comes out of their own pockets. Now, their superintendent of education comes before the committee and says, "We should like to spend some of our own money for this character-education work that was started last year." It is their money and they ought to have some jurisdiction and authority as to how they want to spend the money. Then, I wish to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRUAX] that this work in character education is going to be supervised by Dr. Mann, of the American Council of Education; by some professors from Columbia University; and two from Ohio State University, who have been doing experimental work in character education.

Mr. TRUAX. I wanted to bring out the fact that in Ohio schools were closing by the score prior to the meeting of the fourth session of the general assembly, which placed a sales tax of 3 percent on the backs of the common people so that the schools could reopen; yet here you want to spend $87,000 for educational experimentation and fasten it on the backs of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Because of the fact there is now some difficulty in the gentleman's State and closing of Ohio schools, the gentleman from Ohio, by way of commiseration and sympathy, surely is not going to pull the schools of the District of Columbia down rather than to raise the Ohio schools up?

Mr. TRUAX. No; I would take that $87,000 and send it back to Ohio to open up some schools instead of experimenting down here with these high-priced educators.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman spoke of Government buildings having displaced taxable property. The hearings show that last year these very Government buildings caused visitors from his district, from my district, and from all the States to spend $50,000,000 here in Washington—a bonanza for every commercial interest in Washington.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be sustained.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 33, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For personal services of clerks and other employees, $165,140.

Mr. TRUAX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DITTER: Page 30, line 25, at the beginning of line 25, strike out the figures "$165,140" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$185,480."

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the time of the Committee on this amendment other than to say that this is a further provision for the character-education program. I shall be glad to have a vote on it immediately.

Mr. BLANTON. And a part of the $87,000 extra program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For personal services of teachers and librarians in accordance with the act approved June 4, 1924 (43 Stat., pp. 367–375), including for teachers colleges assistant professors in salary class 11, and professors in salary class 12, $6,896,200: *Provided*, That as teacher vacancies occur during the fiscal year 1936 in grades 1 to 4, inclusive, of the elementary schools, such vacancies may be filled by the assignment of teachers now employed in kindergartens, and teachers employed in kindergartens are hereby made eligible to teach in the said grades: *Provided further*, That teaching vacancies that occur during the fiscal year 1936 wherever found may be filled by the assignment of teachers of special subjects and teachers not now assigned to classroom instruction, and such teachers are hereby made eligible for such assignment without further examination.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DITTER: Page 31, line 11, after the word "twelve", strike out the figures "$6,896,200" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$6,953,100, of which not exceeding $5,000 may be expended for compensation to be fixed by the board of education and traveling expenses of educational consultants employed in character education."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. Clearly the last paragraph of the amendment is legislation unauthorized on an appropriation bill and is a change in existing law. Hence the entire amendment should be stricken out, being subject to the point of order.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, instead of being technical I would prefer to have the amendment voted upon. It is part of the same educational program I stressed before. I ask for a vote on it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order, because there is no law now that permits this arrangement of compensation to be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I shall submit the matter entirely to the hands of the Chair with regard to the objection on the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the compensation now is fixed by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman inform the Chair what is the compensation fixed by law?

Mr. BLANTON. The compensation of all the employees is fixed by law; but this amendment would change the law and allow these officials to fix it. Therefore it is a change in existing law, and is clearly subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is subject to the point of order on the ground that it is a change of existing law. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase and repair of furniture, tools, machinery, material, and books, and apparatus to be used in connection with instruction in manual and vocational training, and incidental expenses connected therewith, $60,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago we lost from our Membership the gentleman from New York, Anthony J. Griffin, for whom I have always had the greatest respect. My respect for him was increased yesterday when I heard the gentleman from Wisconsin discussing the bonus bill, for the reason I had just received copy of a bill that Mr. Griffin had introduced into the House providing for what seemed to me to be a very sensible solution to this bonus question. In the bill it is provided that instead of handling this question as an insurance matter we go back to the original mistake that was made at the time the bonus question first came up and treat the men as though they had been paid the cash which ought to have been paid them at that time, and then pay

them compound interest at the rate of 4 percent from the date of the armistice to the present time on the sum which they ought to have received in cash at that time.

This would entail an expenditure out of Federal funds at this time of approximately $1,250,000,000, or $1,000,000,000 less than the amount provided for in the two bills now before the House, namely, the Vinson bill and the Patman bill. It will treat every veteran alike, and under any bill that has been proposed so far they will not be treated alike. This will enable every veteran, even those who have borrowed on their service certificates, to get an average of approximately $171 apiece. It will enable those who have not borrowed to cash their certificates at once. It will save money to the Government and will render justice to the veterans, because it will remove the mistake that was made in the beginning of this bonus imbroglio.

It seems to me that any way we handle this bonus question, particularly if we accept the provision inflating the currency, to pay it we are going to add a burden on the Government that is not justifiable because there is no reason for doing so. If we adopt the Patman method, and start to handle this question by an inflationary step, we will shake the confidence of the people in this country in every future measure this Congress undertakes, because everyone will assume, including the business people, laborers, and everybody else, that we are starting on a program of inflation which cannot do anything at this time, it seems to me, but cause a great deal of harm.

The bonus program that we launched was the result of two things, an idealism on the part of many of the leaders of the veterans' organizations and a very selfish materialism with the administration in power at that time who desired any measure to avoid paying out cash. The veteran leaders thought it would be better to handle this by the insurance-policy method instead of by the cash method. The administration thought anything would be better than handing out cash and putting it on the tax rolls at that time.

We cannot correct this measure unless we go back, as Mr. GRIFFIN suggested in this bill (H. R. 2019), which has been referred to the Ways and Means Committee, and erase the mistake that we originally made. Assume that we pay these men what should have been paid in 1919 and then pay them compound interest from that time to the present time at the rate of 4 percent. This will clear up, it seems to me, a great many questions that we cannot settle in any other way. It will render justice to the veterans, it will save money to the Government, and it will clear up a question that is confusing everything now before Congress and which is putting every Congressman in a very embarrassing situation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For the pay and allowances of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, in accordance with the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the fire department of the District of Columbia" (43 Stat., pp. 174–175), as amended by the act of July 1, 1930 (46 Stat., pp. 839–841), including compensation at the rate of $2,100 per annum for the present assistant property clerk of the police department, $3,213,500.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. RANDOLPH: Page 41, line 7, after the word "department", strike out "$3,213,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,280,000."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the item as written in the bill is $3,213,500. The amendment which I offer calls for an increase of $66,500 to cover the employment of 35 privates or patrolmen at a yearly salary of $1,900 per annum.

The reason that I ask for this increase today in connection with the discussion of the District appropriation bill is because I have actually tried to look at this matter in a fair and just manner. Major Brown went before the Budget Committee and asked that there be given to him not alone the 35 privates who had been dropped from the police force in 1933 and 1934, but he also asked, in view of the alarming and distressing crime conditions in the District of Columbia, that he be given 100 additional privates. However, when the Commissioners of the District of Columbia went before the Appropriations Committee, they disregarded the request of Major Brown as to the 100 new additions to the police force and asked simply that the 25 which had been dropped in 1933 and the 10 which had been dropped in 1934 be given back to the force.

Since that time the population of the District of Columbia, I may say, has increased from 486,000 to more than a half million residents. In addition to this the Metropolitan Police area includes hundreds of residents who daily come to Washington to transact business or who are connected with business institutions within the District of Columbia. Thousands of others come to the District each week upon Government business from the States which the gentlemen of this House represent.

The great necessity is for patrolmen. We sometimes wonder why we do not always see the policemen on the streets, but this is simply because of the very nature of District of Columbia life. These men are delegated to ceremonies, to the embassies, to legations, to emergency situations, to the protection of school children, the direction of traffic during rush hours, and the like.

I feel that the 25 positions dropped in 1933, and the 10 positions dropped in 1934, a total of 35, should be restored.

I want to make this statement, and then I shall yield to the gentleman from Texas, who is my splendid friend. A compilation of policemen per square mile in 15 cities of the United States shows that Washington, D. C., has fewer policemen to the square mile than any of these comparable cities. I may say that New York City has 56 per square mile, Boston has as many as 51 per square mile, Philadelphia has 39, Newark, N. J., has 57, Chicago has 32, while the District of Columbia has but 19 men to the square mile.

I may say to the chairman of the committee that we found that in 12 cities with respect to the number of policemen to population, taking Newark, N. J., as an example—

In Newark, N. J., with a population of 473,600, they had 1,328 policemen. In Washington, with a population of 472,000, we had 1,262 policemen.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Does my friend know how many patrolmen we have in Washington?

Mr. RANDOLPH. We have about 1,400.

Mr. BLANTON. We have 1,304, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I did not mean to say patrolmen, I was referring to the entire force.

Mr. BLANTON. In addition to that we have a park police here of 76 policemen.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. If my friend will permit me, in addition to the 1,304 patrolmen on the Metropolitan Police force, we have a splendid park police force here, one of the best in the United States, which has 76 policemen. Then we have the White House police force, which has nearly 40, and then we have the Department of Agriculture special police force, and then we have the Capitol special police force, the House Office Building special police force, and the Senate Office Building special police force.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I may say to the gentleman that, certainly, we have a park police, but we have the parks here, and you do not have them in your city.

We have the Capitol here, and you do not have it in your city. We also have these Government departments here, which have to be taken care of.

But that should not take us away from the question of the actual policing of Washington, D. C. We know that in De-

cember the President of the United States was in hearty accord with the crime conference called here, because he wished to strengthen the arm of the law in the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. If my friend will permit, because he is always fair, does my friend know that within the last 4 years we have furnished much money to put these traffic lights at intersections all over Washington, and we have been able to retire a number of traffic policemen and put them back on the regular force.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I may say to the gentleman that if he will go to Dupont Circle and see the situation existing there, regardless of traffic lights, he will know that there will have to be a subway constructed in that section. He must realize that Washington in the next 20 years is going to be a city of three-quarters of a million people. We have outgrown our swaddling clothes.

Mr. BLANTON. I would not be surprised if every person in Texas moved up here, because they have more advantages in Washington than they have in Texas and I should not be surprised if every constituent my friend has in West Virginia does not come here ultimately.

Mr. RANDOLPH. My friends in West Virginia love Washington and they like to come here, but when they do come here they want to know they are going to have protection, and I may say that the safety of the constituents who visit the gentleman is also at stake when they come here. I had a Member of the Congress tell me, in the Capitol restaurant, where I notice the gentleman eats frequently, that one of his prominent constituents had his best overcoat stolen last evening.

In closing, may I say that I believe this request is modest, in view of the alarming situation which we know, if we are honest with ourselves, actually exists here in the National Capital.

I have tried to be fair in the presentation of the amendment. I have not asked what Major Brown asked for and he is the man who is in close contact with this vital situation. I have only asked what the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, after a careful study, have asked from the Committee on Appropriations, and I leave it with the gentleman of the committee if it is not a fact, in view of the actual conditions here, that we should grant this modest request, which is not for a new group of men, but simply placing back upon the force the 35 men who were dropped in 1933 and 1934.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the Members of the House will not think the Appropriations Committees arrive at decisions without exhaustive investigation and statistical information which justify them in the decisions which they reach.

We investigated this matter very thoroughly. We investigated it both as to crime conditions in the District as compared with crime conditions in other jurisdictions and also as to the number of police in Washington as compared with the number of police per 1,000 inhabitants in other cities.

We found crime statistics for Washington were vastly less than those of the average American city. We found more policemen per thousand of population in Washington than in the average American city. We found the rate of pay of police much in excess of the average American city.

In other words, the actual statistics of police efficiency, crime conditions, and appropriations for maintenance of the police force are much more favorable to Washington than to the average American city.

We found—and our information is secured from the official reports of the United States Department of Justice—that only two cities of the United States have more police per capita than Washington. Boston has more police per thousand, and Newark, N. J., has more police per thousand than Washington. We have more than San Francisco, New Orleans, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Chicago, New York, or any other city except the two mentioned.

Br. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Is the gentleman including in that number the Park Police, the Capitol Police, and the White House Police?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. Excluding all extra police, we still have more per thousand than any except the two cities I have mentioned—Boston and Newark.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact, taking the per capita, Washington is the second city in the number of murders and first in the number of robberies?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is mistaken in that. According to the figures of the Department of Justice, in the number of murders in the cities of the United States Washington ranks twenty-seventh.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Per capita?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Per capita. Take the percentage in the nearest city to Washington—Richmond, Va. There the murders are 4.4 per capita; in Washington, 2.1, less than half of that in Richmond, Va.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BEITER. Has the gentleman the number of deaths caused by traffic accidents in Washington compared with other cities?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have the reports from Washington. Comparative statistics of accidents are not compiled by the Department.

Murders, robberies, burglaries, and every other form of crime with which the police deal are more efficiently controlled in Washington than in any of the major cities of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the city of Washington has more police and pays them better and has less crime than any other major city in the United States except Boston and New York.

Mr. BLANTON. And Richmond is a much smaller city than Washington.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman made a statement that we have more police per capita than in other cities. Does the gentleman take into consideration the fact that it is estimated that in Washington we have an average of about 150,000 to 200,000 people here right along as transients, which is not the case in the average American city?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Oh, there is no way of judging the number of transients, although I would say that New York and Chicago undoubtedly have more transients than Washington.

Mr. BOILEAU. Per capita?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I would think that that is true, although that is not the point at issue. The criterion which the Department of Justice judges the relative efficiency in control of crime is the rate per capita, and judged by that standard Washington compares favorably with any other city in the United States.

Mr. BOILEAU. Is it not a fact that the transient population is to be taken into consideration if we are to give protection, because these transients not only cause trouble but they require protection?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am certain we have less transients here than either New York or Chicago.

Mr. BOILEAU. I agree, but does the gentleman maintain that we have more transients in New York per capita than in the city of Washington, the center of the Nation's business? Is it not generally admitted that we have a much

larger transient population in Washington by far than any other city in the Union?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is not admitted, and there is no evidence to indicate it is true. If the gentleman has any statistics, I hope he will cite them.

Mr. BOILEAU. I have not the statistics, though I wish I had.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have those statistics.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have not only better conditions in the city of Washington, more effective preservation of law and order, more police per capita, but we are constantly increasing our police force. It has been increased more than 300 in the last decade. In addition to that increase, both this year and last year—by the institution of traffic lights at the intersections—we have released a number of police formerly on duty as traffic officers at these intersections. Then we have placed radios in police cruising cars, thereby releasing one patrolman; a man for each car so equipped. Heretofore it required two men for each car, now with the radio it requires but one man to a car. As a result of that we were able in effect to add 40 men to the force this year. Where they had previously required two men to a cruising car, now with radio they require but one. We have released in the last 2 years by the installation of traffic lights approximately 25 men. That aggregates 65. We have made other readjustments which increased the efficiency of our police force.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. How many policemen are there in the District of Columbia?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are 1,304, not including park police and numerous other special units.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Pittsburgh is as large as or larger than this community, and has something like 800 policemen.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. And if you were to add 150 new policemen would it insure any change in the present conditions, in the gentleman's judgment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. None whatever. We are amply policed.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I just wanted to support the gentleman's statement.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman not believe that Mr. Brown, head of the police department of Washington, knows more about the police situation than we Members of Congress?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. He ought to be informed, and he did not ask our committee for a single policeman. The statement has been made repeatedly this afternoon that he came before our committee and asked for additional policemen. The hearings will disclose that Superintendent Brown did not ask for additional police.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is a fact that the gentleman from Missouri has the highest regard for the Metropolitan Police force, is it not?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I so expressed myself in the hearings. We have a very efficient force and it is doing its duty. If we felt they needed a single additional man we would insist on his employment. After considering all the information that we could gather on the subject we reached the conclusion that the present force is ample.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Did anyone come before the committee and ask for additional policemen?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No one.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman think that if the authorities needed them they would have come around to see the gentleman rather than go to some outsider?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That would be a very natural conclusion.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is a fact that the board of trade, several citizens' associations, and the business men of this city, 800 strong, went on record publicly in favor of this addition to the police force of Washington, D. C. Is that not a fact?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They sent a delegation which appeared before the committee on another matter, but they did not mention the police force.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Well, that is true.

Mr. BLANTON. They want all the money they can get, naturally.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I have been a member of the subcommittee of the District of Columbia on policemen and firemen, and I am now chairman of that subcommittee. I have never had a request for more policemen for the city of Washington.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is a rather significant statement, that the District Committee has not had any official intimation of any need for additional police.

Mr. Chairman, Washington is the best financed city in the United States. The cost per capita of government in Washington, D. C., is greater than that of any other American city, and while we have no statistics on other countries, I am inclined to think that the cost of government per capita is heavier in Washington than in any other city in the world, amounting to $78.75 per capita. Certainly there is no occasion for increasing this amount while we are struggling to balance the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has again expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that it is very difficult to pass any amendment to any appropriation bill. There are 39 members of the committee, and they are nearly always present, and it is very difficult to get an amendment through.

All I have heard against the amendment is that there is no crime or comparatively no crime, or there is less crime in Washington than in other cities in the United States. There is one thing, however, that I want to call to the attention of the Membership here present, and that is the traffic conditions in Washington. The traffic conditions are such that additional patrolmen and additional traffic men are needed. One hundred and thirty-five people in the District of Columbia lost their lives last year on account of accidents, and hundreds, although I forget exactly how many, were wounded and injured in traffic accidents in the District of Columbia. The life of one American citizen, if it can be saved by the addition of patrolmen or traffic officers, is well worth the expenditure. This Congress should not stand in the way of doing that. If you drive through the streets of this city in the morning from 7:30 to 9:30 or in the afternoon from 4 o'clock until 6 o'clock, you will find the conditions which I have stated. I think the police force of Washington is a good force, efficient, capable, and alert. And they work hard, and they are doing their duty. The gentleman spoke of the Capitol Police, the White House Police, and the Park Police. They have nothing to do with this traffic situation, except in connection with traffic through the parks. But the Washington police are called out on more occasions, I will venture to say, than policemen are in many of the cities of the United States. Conditions are different in this city.

I am not a new Member. For 14 years I have seen this police force in the District of Columbia do its duty as well as, if not better than, any force in the United States. All I am asking the Membership to consider is that if you do not give a sufficient force to take care of traffic conditions in the District of Columbia we cannot expect to reduce the number of deaths and accidents in the District.

Incidentally, there are nearly half as many cars in this small space within the District of Columbia as there are in the entire State of North Carolina; in addition there are those that come from Virginia and Maryland and other States. My reason for addressing the Committee is for the protection of human life and property of our people in the District of Columbia and not with increasing the force or increasing the expense. The addition to the police force of 35 men will be an additional tax upon the District alone.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is a fact that conditions are not comparable to other cities because of our complex national life?

Mr. BULWINKLE. They cannot be compared.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There was no question, Mr. Chairman, that the committee investigated more thoroughly than the cause of traffic deaths on the streets of Washington. Every official of every department of the city government who could be expected to have any information on the subject or who could be expected to offer any explanation or who could be expected to suggest a remedy was carefully examined on this subject. We asked them: "What is the cause of this great increase in traffic deaths in the city, and what is the remedy?"

Mr. Chairman, not one who appeared before us said that the remedy was to increase the number of policemen. Not a man who appeared before us, as an examination of the hearings will disclose, said the increase was due to lack of police.

The gentleman from North Carolina has overlooked this one significant fact, that last year, with less policeman than we have now, we had only 80 traffic deaths. This year, with 40 or 50 more police released from other duties and available for service, the number of traffic deaths were 135, proving conclusively that there is no relation between the number of policemen and the number of traffic deaths.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Then, under the logic of the gentleman, we could keep on decreasing the police force to the point where we had no deaths. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman says that 2 and 2 make 6, but 2 and 2 make 4. I repeat, that increasing the police force has not decreased the number of traffic deaths. This year, with an increase in the available police force, the number of deaths increased from 80 to 135.

Mr. Chairman, the information collated by the committee has demonstrated that there is no need for additional police force. Furthermore, not a single citizen appeared before the committee asking for more policemen. Not an official appeared before the committee asking for more policemen. Not a Congressman appeared before the committee asking for more policemen. The printed hearings show that no individual or organization appeared before us asking for additional policemen. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment should be voted down.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The arguments we have heard would assume that we have not a police force here in Washington. If you were to bring all the 1,304 patrolmen to the Capitol and try to put them in the House Chamber, only one-third of them could be seated, because the seating capacity of the House is only 435. So it would take three shifts to get all of them into the House. That is how many patrolmen we have in Washington.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Just a minute. In addition to the Metropolitan Police of 1,304 patrolmen, we have 76 of the ablest policemen in the world on our Park Police force. No one can violate the law going through those parks. People who drive cars here obey the law better in the parks than anywhere else, because they know they are going to be arrested if they violate the law. The able, skillful park policemen are there.

In addition to that, we have a large force of special policemen in the White House grounds, every one of them having a Metropolitan badge and every one of whom can make an arrest.

Then around the Agricultural Department we have another special police force that has been there for years.

Out here at the Zoo Park we have another special police force policing the Zoo Park. No one can go through there and violate the law with impunity.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friend from West Virginia and to my friend from North Carolina that if we could save one human life in Washington by putting on extra policemen, I would be willing to go the limit with them in putting on extra men.

I have been on this committee, studying this question, for years. I have introduced resolutions that caused more investigations of the police department here, both park and metropolitan, than any other man in Congress. I conducted the investigation of Captain McMorris, who was then at the head of the Park Police force, and caused his removal. I impeached a police commissioner, Col. Frederick A. Fenning, and through an investigation forced his resignation because of improper conduct.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman will admit that the rest of us had something to do with it.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; the gentleman from North Carolina helped. [Laughter.] But I was the instigator of that; I impeached him; I led the attack; I conducted the hearings before the Judiciary Committee and the District Committee for weeks and even months.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I think the gentleman will admit that before he brought it up before the Committee on the Judiciary the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and I took it up before the Veterans' Committee.

Mr. BLANTON. That was after I produced the evidence against him. Oh, the gentleman from North Carolina performed valiant service. I take my hat off to him. He and my friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] helped me immensely, after I worked for months gathering the facts against Colonel Fenning.

But does he know more about this present police situation than our friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who has been studying this question for 23 years? Does he know more about it than the members of this subcommittee and the 39 members of the Committee on Appropriations? Do not these 39 men also have a concern about the protection of human lives? If they felt that the putting on of additional policemen would save human lives, they would have provided for it in this bill. They are just as much interested as is the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina; they are just as much concerned as is our splendid young colleague from West Virginia. But not a man appeared before our committee, from the superintendent of police down, and asked for even one additional policeman.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. All I heard from the gentlemen comprising the appropriations subcommittee was in reference to the matter of crime in the District. I told the gentleman I was not talking about crime; but when he was asked the question about the number of deaths and injuries caused by automobile accidents, I may say we received no facts in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BLANTON. The facts are fully stated in the hearings. May I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that if he will go to a prominent corner in New York City he will see that there is posted daily a bulletin heralding the daily increase to the number of traffic deaths. Every morning they add to the number of traffic deaths in the city of New York. We have traffic deaths everywhere.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Does the gentleman from Texas want me to go to New York to find out what I am attempting to find out from the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, we have plenty of policemen here, I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANDOLPH) there were—ayes 40, noes 43.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For one combination hose wagon and one pumping engine, triple combination, all motor driven, $18,500.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that the two amendments may be read and considered as one.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 45, line 1, after the word "for", strike out the word "one" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three"; and on page 45, line 2, after the word "driven", strike out "$18,500" and insert "$34,500."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the language at the top of page 45, as amended, will read:

For three combination hose wagons and one pumping engine, triple combination, all motor driven, $34,500.

I am very happy that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] have given such complete emphasis to the fact in the previous discussion that nobody from the police department or nobody identified therewith or nobody who is interested in adding officers to the Metropolitan Police force came before the committee with the suggestion or proposal to increase the number. That, however, does not happen to be the case in connection with the fire department. There is nothing better I could do than to read from the hearings as to whether or not these additional pieces of equipment are necessary at this time. I read from the hearings of the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Now, we went out of our way and gave you everything in the world you asked for in the way of equipment last year, as I recall, except one piece of machinery. For this year, I notice you want three combination hose wagons.

Mr. SCHROM. Yes, sir.

Mr. Schrom, by the way, is the chief engineer of the fire department.

Mr. CANNON. Why would not the two we gave you last year be sufficient?

Mr. SCHROM. Mr. Chairman, we have right now 11——

Mr. CANNON. In the repair shop?

Mr. SCHROM. We have 11 that are really old and do not produce the proper efficiency.

Mr. CANNON. What is the difficulty? Are they antiquated?

Mr. SCHROM. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Or obsolete, or worn out—which of the two?

Mr. SCHROM. I would say they are worn out, and I will leave it to the superintendent of machinery to tell you, after I make this remark, that I think our older pieces are only making about 1 mile on a gallon of gasoline. Some of them are as much as 20 years old.

Think of it—there is fire apparatus in the District of Columbia almost 20 years old. Mr. CANNON continues:

Mr. CANNON. While they take more gasoline, do they attain a reasonable rate of speed?

Mr. SCHROM. Some of them do; some not. This estimate is designed to permit the purchase of three combination hose wagons at $8,000 each, and one pumping engine, $10,500.

Long experience has shown that this apparatus should not be kept in service longer than 15 years. To extend this period means to use apparatus that is obsolete in design, worn out and unreliable as to mechanical condition, and lacking power and performance. This is true not only of the pieces in active daily service, but also with regard to replacement pieces which are maintained to relieve apparatus in need of repair, and as active units in time of large fires, storms, and other emergencies.

Then follows a summary, and here is the summary: Number of hose wagons in the District as of 1936, 20 years old, 1. There are two 18 years old, six 17 years old, two 16 years old, and five that are 15 years old.

The number of pumping engines—there will be 7 that are 15 years old, 1 that is 17 years old, and 1 that is 18 years old.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know as it takes any elaboration on my part to show that this equipment is necessary if the District Fire Department is to be equipped with modern appliances, because after all the question of politics, patronage, and all that sort of thing never enters into the question of expeditious and efficacious putting out of fires and the saving of property of the people in the District.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] did not read the important part of the hearings. He did not read the questions I asked the chief as to whether or not they were sufficiently equipped to answer promptly all calls and as to whether there was any danger to either life or property with the present equipment, which would be lessened by the purchase of additional equipment. The chief testified they had ample equipment to meet all calls, that failure to add this additional equipment would in no way imperil life or property or add to the fire hazard in the District. The committee, after careful consideration, was convinced that the new equipment provided by the bill with the additions which the committee authorized last year were ample, and the committee therefore submits that this amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the previous discussion the gentleman from Missouri stated they were always glad to have people come before the committee and submit their requests with respect to District problems in the hope of having the bill conform to the desires of the people.

Here we have the man who has the technical experience in putting out fires and in surveying and estimating the needs of the District so far as fire apparatus is concerned. He is an expert. He has been here a long time. He has been coping with metropolitan fire problems and he requests these additional pieces of equipment. I think, after all, that is the substance of the argument.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is not familiar with the methods obtaining in making departmental estimates. We call before the committee the heads of departments and ask them what they want. They usually ask about twice what they expect to receive. It is not necessary to take more time on this small item. I will simply say, Mr. Chairman, that we have unquestionably a fire department with ample equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 17, noes 37.

So the amendments were rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The disbursing officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the Director of Public Welfare, upon requisitions previously approved by the auditor of the District of Columbia and upon such security as may be required of said Director by the Commissioners, sums of money not to exceed $400 at any one time, to be used for expenses in placing and visiting children, traveling on official business of the board, and for office and sundry expenses, all such expenditures to be accounted for to the accounting officers of the District of Columbia within 1 month on itemized vouchers properly approved.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak under the broad heading of the general welfare of the District of Columbia, and I particularly direct my remarks to the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia on both sides of the aisle. I am not speaking, primarily, in my capacity as a Member of Congress but rather as a taxpayer in the District, as a

home owner, and as the father of several children born in the city of Washington.

It seems to me that the committee and my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] could render a great service to the District and promote the general welfare of the District if they would give some consideration and take some favorable action to limit or wipe out and eradicate the soot nuisance that comes from the extensive and uncontrolled use of soft coal in the District of Columbia. I know nothing that is more injurious to the health of all the people who live in the District, whether young or old. This is one of the dirtiest places in America, filled with dirt and smoke and soot, and everyone who lives here knows this to be the fact. They know this by simply looking at the window sills of their rooms. They are covered every day with a heavy layer of soot. This soot and smoke is injurious to the eyes, nose, throat, and the lungs of both young and old.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARLAN. The gentleman states that Washington is one of the dirtiest cities in the country. Has the gentleman ever been in Cincinnati or Pittsburgh?

Mr. FISH. I am pleased that the gentleman has asked this question. A few years ago I think Pittsburgh had the reputation of being about the dirtiest city in America. They have taken hold of this problem and they have applied drastic measures to eradicate the grime and soot nuisance in that city and with great success. I assume the gentleman represents a district that produces soft coal. I do not know whether the gentleman does or not, but I am simply inferring that from the question which he has asked.

Mr. HARLAN. We do not produce any coal.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman's State does.

Let me repeat, Pittsburgh has taken hold of this problem and has eliminated, so far as humanly possible, the soot and the dirt and the smoke from soft coal that is used in that city.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman ever been in Poughkeepsie?

Mr. FISH. As the gentleman has raised that question, that city, a very lovely and beautiful city, is situated in one of the finest congressional districts in the United States, in the highlands of the Hudson, only 3 miles from where the President of the United States has his home.

Mr. BLANTON. And where Vassar College thrives.

Mr. FISH. As a matter of fact, Poughkeepsie has not any smoke nuisance whatever, if the gentleman implies that.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say this to our friend from New York: If he will bring to the committee of which I am a member any plan we have authority to handle that will get rid of this nuisance in Washington, he will find a ready and sympathetic ear and action taken immediately.

Mr. FISH. That is all I am speaking about.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the gentleman's remedy? How are we going to stop it? We are not a legislative committee. We are an appropriating committee.

Mr. FISH. I will tell the gentleman how to stop it. In the first place, I understand a huge petition will be presented, signed by tens of thousands of the inhabitants of this District, requesting some action by your committee to eradicate the smoke and the soot and the dirt nuisance in order to protect the health of the people here.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from New York has been here a long time and he knows that our committee is nothing in the world but an appropriating committee. It has no power over legislation at all. We cannot provide anything that is a change of law. Anything that changes present existing law has to come through the legislative committee, and the gentleman will admit that we are handicapped, and cannot place in our bill any legislative matter.

Mr. FISH. I think the gentleman heard what I said in the beginning. I said that I had hoped the members of the District of Columbia Committee were present while I was making these remarks, and naturally I inferred that the members of that committee would be here when your subcommittee on appropriations has the District bill under consideration.

Mr. BLANTON. But the Committee on Appropriations is powerless to remedy the situation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. FISH. Absolutely powerless; but I will say this to the gentleman from Texas: As a member of this subcommittee and as a member of the Committee of the Whole House, he is not powerless on anything, and I am asking for his help in a very worthy cause.

Let me now go back to the situation existing here. I understand various civic organizations are going to submit a petition, signed by thousands of the taxpayers of the District, asking merely for relief and the abatement of the soot and smoke nuisance from the Congress, which is the governing body of the District. It is the function of every individual Member of Congress, but primarily of the District Committee, to help protect the health and promote the general welfare of the people living in the city of Washington.

Now, what can be done? There are several things. First, you can do what New York City does. You can prohibit the use of soft coal entirely. Its use is prohibited in New York City and, I presume, in other large cities in the country. This is the first and most drastic procedure. Next, you can put through various regulations to compel the use of certain screens to prevent soot and other kinds of cinders from going all over the city and into the lungs of the young children of Washington.

There is another consideration which I failed to mention. We have appropriated in recent years, and very properly so, millions upon millions of dollars to erect the most beautiful Government buildings in order to make Washington the greatest and most beautiful city in the world.

Many of these buildings have been erected, and many of them are already discolored because they have no protection from the soot and smoke resulting from the uncontrolled use of soft coal on an extensive scale.

I am making my plea hoping the District members here and others interested, when the matter is presented to you by petition of the people of Washington, will do what you can to eliminate this nuisance, in spite of the opposition coming from the soft-coal districts in the United States, and you will find plenty of opposition on both sides of the House. I believe you are interested in the welfare of the District, and I hope you will give it your immediate attention, and that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], with his ability and energy, will assist in getting favorable consideration of the petition asking for immediate relief from Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think also that the lungs of Members of Congress ought to be protected from soot? The smoke nuisance is a constant menace to their well-being and to that of their families.

Mr. FISH. I certainly do. Now, I cannot agree with the gentleman who spoke today asking that loudspeakers be installed in the House. It seems to me we have got along pretty well for 150 years without having any of these newfangled contrivances, loudspeakers and megaphones. If your constituents elect you and send you down here, they do not send you here to speak through megaphones or loudspeakers. I am opposed to putting a broadcasting system into the House of Representatives except when the President speaks. Each Member ought to have the ability and capacity

to stand on the floor of the House and use his own voice and not be obliged to speak through a loudspeaker, megaphone, amplifier, or anything of that kind. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses: For general expenses in connection with the maintenance, care, improvement, furnishing of heat, light, and power of public parks, grounds, fountains, and reservations, propagating gardens and greenhouses under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including not to exceed $5,000 for the maintenance of the tourists' camp on its present site in East Potomac Park, and including personal services of seasonal or intermittent employees at per diem rates of pay approved by the Director, not exceeding current rates of pay for similar employment in the District of Columbia; the hire of draft animals with or without drivers at local rates approved by the Director; the purchase and maintenance of draft animals, harness, and wagons; contingent expenses; city directories; communication service; car fare; traveling expenses; professional, scientific, technical, and law books; periodicals and reference books, blank books and forms; photographs; dictionaries and maps; leather and rubber articles for the protection of employees and property; the maintenance, repair, exchange, and operation of not to exceed two motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and all necessary bicycles, motorcycles, and self-propelled machinery; the purchase, maintenance, and repair of equipment and fixtures, and so forth, $365,000: *Provided*, That not exceeding $20,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended for placing and maintaining portions of the parks in condition for outdoor sports and for expenses incident to the conducting of band concerts in the parks; and not exceeding $10,000 for the erection of minor auxiliary structures.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

A Member of this House who passed from this life a few years ago, Will Wood of Indiana, appeared before our special committee investigating Government competition with private enterprise, and spoke in language both vigorous and profane. He said: "If you expect any truthful information from any of these blank bureaus or boards, you are a d—— fool."

The chairman of the subcommittee that considered this appropriation bill, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, had before him one of the so-called "bureau heads", and he asked him specifically concerning this item of $5,000 for the maintenance of the tourists' camp in Potomac Park. As I read the hearings before the subcommittee, I can see what the chairman was driving at. He wanted to save this item of $5,000. He persisted in his questioning, and the bureau head continued to find excuses for the item.

I ask the indulgence of the House at this time to place in the RECORD, for the enlightenment of future committees, just what was disclosed in the hearings before our special investigating committee, concerning this particular activity of the Welfare and Recreational Association, which is described as a private corporation incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia and operating under a franchise granted by the former Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks.

I offer copies of three letters, which were made a part of the records of our special committee, purporting to have passed between F. W. Hoover, general manager of the Welfare and Recreational Association, and a certain hotel in this city. The first is a letter from Mr. Hoover to the hotel stating that it had been approved as satisfactory for overflow from the tourist camp; the second is a letter from Mr. Hoover to the hotel dunning it for commissions on the business sent it from the tourist camp; and the third is a letter to Mr. Hoover from the hotel transmitting a check for $18.10 to cover the 20-percent commission.

This so-called "recreational organization" has a system by which, if your wife or children were to go to it for accommodations, or ask to be directed to an approved hotel in the city, they would be sent to a hotel on their list, and immediately thereafter this organization would set out to collect 20 percent of the money received by the hotel it recommended.

Mr. CANNON tried to ascertain why this $5,000 was needed. He was told that it was not needed, that the tourist camp was a going concern, and that they would not use the money, but they wanted it as a matter of safety. This is purely a business venture, where a public agency is levying on private industry. I do not believe there is a community in the United States that would tolerate such a practice.

I do not wish, at this moment, to raise a point against this particular item, for the reason I believe the gentlemen who considered the bill were honest in their belief that it should be included in the appropriations. But I do think the RECORD should contain these communications, a part of the official record of our special committee, and I ask unanimous consent that they be made a part of my remarks at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that his remarks be extended in the manner indicated by including certain excerpts and letters. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANNON. It is hardly fair to the committee to ask that this item be struck from the bill at this time, especially in view of the fact that the chairman tried to get light on it from the Bureau; but I wish to make these remarks so that in the future the chairman will have this evidence, should he wish to use it in respect to another request for a similar appropriation.

The matter referred to follows:

Mr. Ringgold Hart, counsel, National Restaurant Association, Washington, D. C., testified December 7, 1932, before the committee:

"There came to my attention, and I transmitted to Mr. SHANNON, as chairman of the committee, three copies of letters that passed between the secretary of the Welfare and Recreational Association, Mr. Hoover, and a certain hotel. It involved the question of the tourist camp in Potomac Park. We thought the tourist camp was operated for people who came to visit the Capital and was not intended to be operated for profit. In the years 1930 and 1931 there was a tremendous profit made from the operation of that tourist camp. The statement which I submitted to Mr. SHANNON showed that the Welfare and Recreational Association profited to the extent of $25,845.95 in the year 1930 and $18,003.48 in 1931.

"Notwithstanding that profit, the secretary of the Welfare and Recreational Association demanded a 20-percent cut from tourists who could not procure accommodations at that tourist camp and were transferred to hotels. I respectfully submit that that was a wrong procedure. I submitted to you a copy of a letter from Mr. Hoover making that demand, a copy of the letter from the hotel in reply thereto, and a copy of the letter transmitting a check covering the 20 percent.

"Frank W. Hoover is secretary of the Welfare and Recreational Association, which is a private corporation incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia."

In accordance with the request which you recently made of me, an inspection has been made of the Gordon Hotel with a view to placing it on the approved list at the Washington tourist camp. The inspector has passed it as possessing satisfactory accommodations for overflow from the tourist camp.

The manager of the tourist camp has been advised to place the Gordon Hotel on the list of hostelries to which tourists are sent who cannot be accommodated at the camp. It is suggested that you furnish Mr. Clarke, manager of the camp, a supply of your special rate cards on which he can stamp the name of the camp.

You understand that this association requires in return for the inspection given your hotel and its listing at the camp payment of 20 percent of the gross revenues from the guests sent you. Payments should be made on or before the 5th of each month for the preceding month.

Very truly yours,

F. W. HOOVER, *General Manager.*

In order that the business of this association for the month of August may be closed at the earliest practicable date, please submit your check for commissions on business sent you from the tourist camp during the month of August as soon as convenient.

Very truly yours,

F. W. HOOVER, *General Manager.*

SEPTEMBER 6, 1932.

DR. F. W. HOOVER,
General Manager Welfare and Recreational
Association of Public Buildings and Grounds,
1052 New Navy Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOOVER: Enclosed find check for $18.10 to comply with our agreement for commissions on the business sent to us for the month of August.

Thanking you for this business, I remain,

Yours very truly,

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GREENWOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3973, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SHANLEY, for 2 days.

To Mr. DRISCOLL, at the request of Mr. HAINES, for 2 days, on account of important business.

PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Eighty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1934.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1935.*

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PANAMA CANAL

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1934.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1935.*

ALASKA RAILROAD

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Territories:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Alaska Railroad for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1934.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1935.*

PERRY'S VICTORY MEMORIAL COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 28)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Fifteenth Annual Report of the Perry's Victory Memorial Commission for the year ended December 1, 1934.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1935.*

EXCELLENT RECORD OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the Federal Trade Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, possibly what I have to say might have been more appropriately said when the independent offices appropriation bill was before the House for consideration a short time ago. Lacking the opportunity at that time, I now ask the indulgence of my colleagues for a few minutes in order to direct their attention to the work of an establishment of the Federal Government about which we may not hear a great deal either here on the floor of the House or in the public press. Nevertheless, it is my judgment, and I have taken the trouble to make some inquiries, that the establishment I have in mind is performing a most valuable service to the great consuming masses in this country.

Particularly is this true as to the smaller business and manufacturing interests, the "little fellow" who is engaged in business, and the small corporations and industrial concerns which are not able to maintain highly paid legal staffs, yet which are in much need of the service that this agency performs in protecting them from unfair trade practices and the sometimes greedy and selfish instincts and practices of the more powerful corporate interests, without which protection the small merchant and manufacturer might find it even more difficult to stay in business than he does find it now, rough as the going has been in recent years.

I am referring to the Federal Trade Commission. It is one of the smaller establishments of the Federal Government, with a small personnel, as Government departments and establishments go, and with relatively small appropriations, which I believe for the next fiscal year will be approximately $1,400,000.

KIEFER MAYER'S TRIBUTE

Recently, I received from a constituent of mine a highly commendatory letter about a phase of the work which the Federal Trade Commission is doing. The writer is Mr. A. K. Mayer, of Indianapolis, familiarly known in that city and throughout Indiana as Kiefer Mayer. Mr. Mayer is head of a large wholesale drug firm in my home city and is president of the National Wholesale Druggists' Association. Under the sponsorship of the Federal Trade Commission, there was recently held in Chicago a trade-practice conference for the wholesale drug industry of the country, with Commissioner Charles H. March presiding. At that conference there were about 500 wholesale druggists in attendance or represented by proxy, doing an annual business of more than $500,000,000, or probably 90 percent or more of the total volume of the wholesale drug business in the entire country. Of the success of that conference, Mr. Mayer wrote me in part as follows:

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW:

Yesterday the wholesale drug industry had a trade-practice conference in Chicago, under the auspices of the Federal Trade Commission, with Hon. Charles H. March, Commissioner, presiding. There were over 500 in attendance, with approximately 95 percent of the members of the industry either present or represented by proxy.

In 1 hour and 35 minutes the different divisions of the wholesale drug industry approved rules of business conduct that, when approved by the Federal Trade Commission, will eliminate most of the unfair trade practices and trade abuses that have crept into the industry. These will turn wasteful methods into profits without any increase in prices to the consumer.

Before this formal conference, representatives of the industry spent about 7 hours with Judge McCorkle, director of trade-practice conferences of the Federal Trade Commission, so that altogether in less than 9 hours the industry wrote new rules under this Government agency and accomplished more than they had been able to do in 18 months before. These gentlemen in the Federal Trade Commission know their subject. They can give you a frank, clear, concise answer. If Congress would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so that they could investigate and approve costs for an industry, it would solve the greater portion of the difficulties of American industry and would increase wages and employment in line with the wishes of the President.

Congress will no doubt consider amendments to or a revision of the N. I. R. A., and I just can't refrain from giving you my statements outlined above.

Trusting you are enjoying your usual good health and with very kind personal regards, I am,

Very respectfully,

A. K. MAYER.

VALUE OF TRADE-PRACTICE CONFERENCES

These trade-practice conferences have developed into an important and valuable phase of the work the Federal Trade Commission is doing. The plan for holding such conferences was developed in 1919, and their purpose is the elimination of unfair methods of competition or trade abuses. I am informed that approximately 150 such conferences have been held. They afford an opportunity for members of an industry to sit down together and under the auspices of the Federal Trade Commission consider methods for the correction or elimination of unfair and unethical business practices. It is a process in which an industry takes the initiative in establishing self-government, making its own rules of business conduct, subject, of course, to approval by the Commission, and necessarily within the limitations of law. Of course, the objective insofar as the Federal Trade Commission is concerned is to see that the interests of the public are protected. I am informed that it is the experience of the Federal Trade Commission with these conferences that they have resulted in a clearly marked trend toward higher standards of business conduct and that the agreements made by industries engaging in these conferences have been lived up to almost 100 percent.

SAVINGS OF HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS

There is another job the Federal Trade Commission is doing in which it is rendering a service to the American consumers that is saving them hundreds of millions of dollars. I refer to the investigation the Commission has been making of the electric and gas public utilities of the country. This investigation has been under way for more than 6 years and has been conducted under authority of a resolution introduced by the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana. This investigation has reached its final phase, and the Commission is now making its final report, which, I am informed, will include recommendations for legislation for the correction of evils that have grown up in the public-utility industries. About the time the Federal Trade Commission made public its annual report for the last fiscal year, the Washington Daily News in its issue of December 27, 1934, carried an editorial commenting on the value of the Federal Trade Commission to the American public, and especially the importance of the utility investigation. That editorial said in part:

Any one of a dozen achievements of the Federal Trade Commission last year may be cited as worth more in dollars to the American people than the cost of maintaining that useful Government agency. This is clear from its current annual report.

On a budget slightly in excess of a million dollars, the Commission last year carried on its customary policing of industry, between the various units and between industry and consumers.

In addition it did many other things. Its disclosure of malpractices and financial juggling in the electric and gas utility industries already has saved consumers millions of dollars. It may save them much more, if state regulatory bodies make proper use of this information.

Its study of monopolistic practices in the milk business can yield rich dividends in higher prices to dairy farmers and at the same time lower prices to milk consumers.

Its investigative services for N. R. A., A. A. A., and T. V. A. have measurably increased the efficiency of those Government agencies.

Its analysis of price-basing systems, steel-industry practices, gasoline-price trends, and corporate salaries are essential to Congress in framing important legislation.

Selfish interests, which want to be left free to exploit the people, try every year in Congress to cripple the Commission by curtailing its budget.

Few, if any, other branches of the Government give taxpayers as much for their money.

About the same time another great newspaper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, printed an editorial entitled "A Great Public Service." Commenting on the utilities investigation, that editorial said in part:

The country is indebted for the investigation to the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, whose resolution precipitated a battle which was in some respects a turning point in American history. Walsh asked for a special Senate committee to conduct the investigation, but after a long battle the utilities succeeded in substituting the Federal Trade Commission.

If the utilities thought the Commission would make a less exhaustive investigation than a Senate committee would have made, they were sadly mistaken. It became apparent at the outset that the Commission was not going to slight its task, and it never has done so. Its published reports are now a matter of public record. They tell the story of an exploitation which has no parallel outside the railroad industry in the United States. It is not an exaggeration to say that this investigation ended the dispute over Muscle Shoals; that it was the inspiration of the Tennessee Valley project; that it crystallized the Government's new policy with respect to such social services as electricity, gas, water, and communication.

SAVINGS ARE CUMULATIVE

It is not possible to estimate closely the amount of savings which the American consuming public has enjoyed from electric and gas rates reductions that have resulted directly or indirectly from disclosures made during the Commission's investigation. Nearly a year ago, an estimate was made based on rate reductions noted during the years 1930 to 1933, inclusive, by a prominent trade journal in the electrical field. During that 4-year period, the publication in question noted 139 reductions with a total estimated consumer saving amounting to nearly $120,000,000. Fifty-eight additional reductions were noted, but without the amount of the reductions being given. They were, therefore, not included in any estimate of consumer savings. If these savings were known and there could be added to them savings due to rate reductions which escaped the attention of the technical papers, they would probably add many millions of dollars annually to the amount of consumer savings. These savings are, of course, cumulative because they continue in force from year to year, and some of them will in all probability be increased by further reductions, so that the total in a few years will unquestionably exceed a billion dollars. The figures I have mentioned do not include any gas-rate reductions at all, relating only to electric rates.

Up to the present the Commission has filed with the Senate 73 volumes of reports covering the record made up during the investigation, of which 65 volumes have been printed as Senate documents, the other 8 now being in the hands of the Printer. In addition, it has filed its final report on the propaganda activities of the utilities and has sent to the Senate two installments of its final report on the corporate organization, control, and financial practices of holding companies and their subsidiaries in the electric and gas field. The inquiry has covered corporations with assets of more than $10,000,000,000 and has included the investigation by members of the Commission's staff of 18 superholding companies, 42 subholding companies, and 91 operating companies, as well as many other affiliated companies.

At last reports, the total cost to the Federal Treasury of the power and gas utility investigation over the period of more than 6 years since the inquiry was launched was not quite $2,000,000. Certainly, the consuming public has already been paid handsome dividends for the investment made in this investigation, not to mention the public benefit which will follow whatever regulatory policy may be adopted by the Congress in its wisdom, based upon the information gathered during the inquiry.

In my remarks, I have called attention to only two phases of the work the Federal Trade Commission is doing. Of course, there are many others, but I think I have said enough to do what I had in mind, that is, bring to your attention the value of this establishment which in many particulars is the only Government agency that gives protection to the consuming masses and the smaller businesses and industries of the country.

FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS GIVE HIGH ORDER OF SERVICE

I should like to say in conclusion that the work of this Commission is probably of special interest to many of you because of the presence on it of two of our former colleagues. I refer to the Honorable Ewin L. Davis, of Tennessee, who is now serving as chairman, and the Honorable William A. Ayres, of Kansas, who last summer resigned his seat in this House to accept a position on the Commission by appointment of President Roosevelt. Other members of the Commission are Hon.

Garland S. Ferguson, Jr., of North Carolina, and Hon. Charles H. March, of Minnesota. The fifth place on the Commission is now vacant, but it is expected that it will be filled soon by appointment by the President. Commissioner Davis, the chairman, was for 14 years a Member of this House and served as Chairman of the important Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries. Mr. Ayres is a veteran of 20 years in this House and for several years was my associate on the Appropriations Committee and was chairman of the Naval Appropriations Subcommittee. Most of you know these gentlemen personally and know the high order of service of which they are capable and the broad experience which they have brought to their duties in the responsible positions they now occupy. It is my information and my judgment that that important Commission has never engaged upon more important work than is now receiving its attention and never performed its duties with more ability and dispatch than now.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until Monday, January 21, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

128. A letter from the president of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting the annual report of the company for the year ended December 31, 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

129. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

130. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of bill authorizing superannuation disability pay for alien employees of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

131. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a report showing the names of the persons employed under the appropriation for the support of United States prisoners, the annual rate of compensation paid to each, together with a description of their duties; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

132. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to increase the statutory limit of expenditures for repairs or changes to naval vessels; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

133. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1903, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1902, Thirty-second Statutes at Large, page 662; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

134. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a statement of the expenditures under appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1934; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

135. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill for the relief of the officers and men of the United States Naval and Marine Corps Reserves who performed flights in naval aircraft in connection with the search for victims and wreckage of the United States dirigible *Akron;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

136. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

137. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of the Western Electric Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

138. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the cost ascertainment report for the fiscal year 1934; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

139. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Mrs. Carlysle Von Thomas, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

140. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the payment of allowances and gratuities to naval prisoners; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

141. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Jasper Daleo; to the Committee on Claims.

142. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Russell B. Putnam, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 4232) to provide for the payment of old-age pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4233) to provide for weekly pay days for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. EKWALL: A bill (H. R. 4234) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building for the use of station A, a station of the post office at Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4235) to promote the general welfare of the United States in a comprehensive plan to control destructive floods of the Wabash and White Rivers and their tributaries, to conserve the soil from erosion, build up forest reserves, preserve wildlife, increase recreational centers with cabin and cottage sites, utilize submarginal lands, expand subsistence farming, extend water navigation and commerce, produce electrical energy for interstate transmission, provide a healthy and cheaper water supply for household and irrigation purposes, and to relieve unemployment among the people; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. IMHOFF: A bill (H. R. 4236) to authorize the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to issue $1,500,000,000 of additional bonds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEE: A bill (H. R. 4237) to provide for the immediate redemption of adjusted-service certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 4238) to authorize the acquisition of an addition to the site heretofore acquired and the erection on such site and addition of a Federal building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 4239) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the city of Grand Haven, Mich., certain portions of the Grand Haven Lighthouse Reservation, Mich.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 4240) to extend the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 2 years; to authorize loans or renewals or extensions to mature not later than January 31, 1945; to empower the Corporation to buy railroad obligations, with approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in aid of railroad reorganization and in certain other circumstances; to empower the Corporation (a) to aid the mortgage situation generally by the purchase of nonassessable stock in mortgage loan companies and similar financial institutions, and to authorize the sale of stock, capital notes, or debentures purchased by the Corporation; and (b) to purchase any portion of the assets of closed banks under certain conditions; to increase the authorized investments in preferred stock and capital notes of insurance companies, or loans thereon, from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000; to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation and the export-

import banks of Washington, D. C., as agencies of the United States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEARIN: A bill (H. R. 4241) to provide for the flood control of the Mississippi River and the Missouri River; to provide for reforestation and the use of marginal lands in the Missouri Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of the Mississippi Valley and the Missouri Valley; to provide for the restoration and preservation of the water level in the Missouri Valley; to provide for the flood control of the Missouri River and the Mississippi River; to improve the navigability of the Missouri River where feasible; to provide for the development of electrical power in the Missouri Valley; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. WOODRUM: A bill (H. R. 4242) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to private colleges, universities, and institutions of higher learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 4243) to provide a tax on the transfers of estates of decedents; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4244) to increase the motor-vehicle fuel tax in the District of Columbia, and to provide for the better administration thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4245) relating to the contributions of the United States toward defraying the expenses of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4246) to provide for the taxation of incomes in the District of Columbia, and to repeal certain provisions of law relating to the taxation of intangible personal property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4247) to require the registration of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, to prescribe registration fees based upon the weight of such motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 4248) to reclassify salaries of employees in the custodial service of the Treasury and Post Office Departments of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 4249) to provide for the establishment of a national monument on the site of Fort Stanwix, in the State of New York; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4250) to provide for the establishment of a national monument on the site of Fort Stanwix, in the State of New York; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WERNER: A bill (H. R. 4251) to create an Indian Claims Court for the immediate settlement of tribal and band claims, defining the powers and functions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEPPEL: A bill (H. R. 4252) to amend section 1 of Public Act No. 174, Fifty-ninth Congress, approved March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217), to provide reciprocal Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and United States civil-service retirement credits; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 4253) relating to the cancelation of star-route mail contracts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 4254) to prohibit the use of traps, weirs, and pound nets for fishing in the waters of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOEPPEL: A bill (H. R. 4296) to create employment by the extension of loans to retired Federal beneficiaries and to disabled war veterans and their dependents, for the construction of subsistence homesteads, without cost or risk on the part of the Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTE HILL: A bill (H. R. 4297) to provide funds for cooperation with White Swan School District, No. 88, Yakima County, Wash., for extension of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children of the Yakima Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MASSINGALE: A bill (H. R. 4298) to amend title I of an act entitled "Agricultural Adjustment Act" (Public, No. 10, 73d Cong.) and to provide additional relief by securing to the farmers a minimum price for agricultural commodities of not less than the cost of production thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4299) for the relief of the city of Baltimore; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 4300) to fix the date of the annual meeting of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: Resolution (H. Res. 61) to direct the standing Committee of the District of Columbia or the subcommittee thereof to investigate any and all conditions affecting rentals and rental properties in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAMNECK: Resolution (H. Res. 62) to create a committee of seven Members of the House to make a thorough and complete investigation on the monetary policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEFAN: Resolution (H. Res. 63) authorizing Architect of the Capitol to determine ways and means to improve audition in House Chamber; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LEMKE: Resolution (H. Res. 64) amending section 4 of rule XXVII of the rules adopted as the rules of the Seventy-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) to clarify the definition of disagreement in section 19, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REED of New York: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 114) directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) directing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEENEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 116) authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Commodore John Barry; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding the sale of munitions of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, regarding the designation of Floyd Bennett Field as an air-mail service station for the city of New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 4255) for the relief of Charles F. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4256) for the relief of Anna Caporaso; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 4257) granting a pension to Olaf Moen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 4258) for the relief of Anna Carroll Taussig; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DREWRY: A bill (H. R. 4259) for the relief of George R. Slate; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EKWALL: A bill (H. R. 4260) for the relief of Philip McEntee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4261) for the relief of Grayson E. Pedigo; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4262) for the relief of Owen Ewart Smith; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4263) for the relief of William H. Wannebo; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4264) granting an increase of pension to June MacMillan Ordway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4265) for the relief of William J. C. Schuldt; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 4266) granting a pension to Felix Jaranowski; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 4267) granting a pension to Abraham J. Steedly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: A bill (H. R. 4268) granting a pension to Catherine J. Hoyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4269) for the relief of Clyde William Tarrant; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 4270) granting a pension to Charlotte M. Spaulding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4271) granting a pension to Nancy A. Keiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4272) granting a pension to Clara E. Bryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4273) for the relief of Irving Levine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4274) correcting date of enlistment of Elza Bennett in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 4275) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the claim of William Quinlan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 4276) for the relief of Kate Carter Lyons; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 4277) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse James R. Russell for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 4278) for the relief of Charles B. Malpas; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4279) for the relief of Charles B. Malpas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 4280) for the relief of Emil Chalupa; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OWEN: A bill (H. R. 4281) for the relief of Ralph W. Pennington; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4282) for the relief of Ulysses Green; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLUMLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 4283) for the settlement by the Secretary of the Interior of certain claims for services rendered to the Mississippi Choctaw Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANSLEY: A bill (H. R. 4284) for the relief of Joseph Pasquarello; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4285) granting a pension to Rachel Fuson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4286) granting an increase of pension to William Napier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4287) for the relief of Frederick E. Dixon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 4288) authorizing the appropriation of $600,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to refund payments made to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia for illegally assessed taxes for paving roadways or laying curbs or gutters in the District of Columbia, including penalties charged and paid, as may on the date of approval of this act be legally due Paving Tax Refund Corporation of the District of Columbia, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4289) granting a pension to Arthur Boyce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4290) for the relief of Harriet V. Schindler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4291) for the relief of Jeremiah Aldersley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4292) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a right-of-way to the Arlington & Fairfax Railway Co. across the Fort Myer Reservation, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 4293) granting an increase of pension to Corrie A. Chubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TURPIN: A bill (H. R. 4294) for the relief of Louis A. Miller; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 4295) granting a pension to Daniel W. Perkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

234. By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Petition signed by William J. Mahoney, president of the Ward Three Community Club of Haverhill, Mass., and by 197 other citizens of that city, urging the adoption of the Townsend plan of old-age revolving pensions; to the Committee on Labor.

235. By Mr. BACON: Memorial of the Franklin Society for Home Building and Savings, protesting against the present unfair discrimination against State-chartered savings-and-loan associations in favor of Federal savings-and-loan associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

236. By Mr. BOILEAU: Resolution of the Stevens Point Division, No. 54, Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, favoring enactment of legislation as recommended by the Federal Coordinator and covered in House bill 8100 of the Seventy-third Congress and reintroduced in the Seventy-fourth Congress in House bill 3263; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

237. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Xavier Alumni Sodality, New York City, N. Y., regarding conditions in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

238. Also, resolution unanimously adopted by Lafayette Council, No. 487, Knights of Columbus, at its regular meeting held December 27, 1934, regarding conditions in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

239. By Mr. BRUNNER: Resolution of the South Side Regular Democratic Club, Inc., Jamaica, N. Y., asking Congress to make additional funds available for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

240. By Mr. CULLEN: Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 15, State of New York, requesting legislation looking to either taking all profits out of war or putting the business of manufacturing munitions of war solely in the hands of the United States Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

241. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, urging that the Floyd Bennett Field Airport, in the borough of Brooklyn, State of New York, be designated as an air-mail service station for the city of New York and the

environs of such city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

242. By Mr. DIES: Petition signed by W. H. Davidson and 605 others; to the Committee on Labor.

243. Also, petition signed by Alaman Evans and 301 others; to the Committee on Labor.

244. Also, petition signed by B. Rolston and 183 others; to the Committee on Labor.

245. Also, petition signed by N. R. Harrecy and 213 others; to the Committee on Labor.

246. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the Franklin Society of New York, protesting against subsection H of section 5 of the Home Owners' Act of 1933 relating to Federal savings-and-loan associations whereby all shares of such associations shall be exempt from all taxation, except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

247. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of E. M. Simmons and 82 other citizens of Scott City, Kans., urging the enactment of the Townsend plan for old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

248. Also, petition of Roy H. Traylor and 168 other citizens of Plains, Kans., urging the enactment of the Townsend plan for old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

249. Also, petition of R. D. Brown and 121 other citizens of Fowler, Kans., urging the enactment of the Townsend plan for old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

250. Also, petition of Cora Morrison and 59 other citizens of Kingman, Kans., urging the enactment of the Townsend plan for old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

251. By Mr. KENNEDY of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to consider legislation looking to either taking all profits out of war or putting the business of manufacturing munitions of war solely in the hands of the United States Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

252. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York, memorializing Congress and the Postmaster General of the United States to take appropriate action to the end that the Floyd Bennett Field Airport in the borough of Brooklyn, State of New York, be designated as an air-mail service station for the city of New York and the environs of such city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

253. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to supplement the regulations made by this State pertaining to the production, handling, and marketing of milk within the State by making effective at the earliest possible date such Federal regulations as will place milk produced in other States and marketed within the State of New York under similar regulations to those applied by this State to milk produced within its borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

254. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the American Federation of Labor, with respect to designation of employment of nonunion workers by the Public Works Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

255. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of 165 citizens of Jasper, Minn., favoring legislation for the Townsend plan of old-age revolving pensions; to the Committee on Labor.

256. Also, petition of 826 citizens of Chippewa and Swift Counties, Minn., favoring legislation for the Townsend plan of old-age revolving pensions; to the Committee on Labor.

257. Also, petition of the Glenwood Townsend Club, of Glenwood, Minn., favoring legislation for the Townsend plan of old-age revolving pensions; to the Committee on Labor.

258. Also, petition with reference to relief signed by various residents of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

259. Also, petition of the Lac qui Parle Post, No. 158, American Legion, Madison, Minn., opposing any compromise payment on adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

260. Also, petition of the Gust F. Holden Post, No. 253, American Legion, Lowry, Minn., urging the immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

261. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Mrs. Robert Levy, of 78 South Trexel Avenue, and a number of other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging that the Nye munitions investigation be continued; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

262. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the American Homestead Protective Association, requesting that Congress shall establish uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the Nation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

263. Also, petition of the Medical Society of the State of New York, regarding Dr. Van Etten's 10 points presented to and adopted by the 1934 house of delegates of the American Medical Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

264. Also, petition of the National Council, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, regarding the decrease in alien deportations; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

265. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of New York, regarding the manufacturers of munitions, against the best interests of the citizens of our country, who have been wont to sell and transport to foreign countries munitions of war, poison gases, and other death-dealing devices, which could be used against our own soldiers in the event of war between us and some foreign country, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

266. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition urging amendment of bankruptcy laws by American Homestead Protective Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

267. Also, petition urging immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates by Woodrow Wilson Post, No. 2; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

268. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petition of the farmers of Rusk County, Tex., urging appropriation of funds for crop-production loans for 1935; to the Committee on Agriculture.

269. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America, New Philadelphia, Ohio, organized into a bona fide trade union, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, requesting the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, of the State of New York, to again introduce his labor-disputes bill in its original form at the convening session of Congress, urging Members of Congress to support the bill in its amended form; to the Committee on Labor.

270. Also, petition of the Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, Akron Division, No. 186, by their secretary, C. A. Tinley, requesting by their body, consisting of 406 railway employees, exclusive of their families, to support to the fullest extent enactment of legislation to modify the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act to regulate commerce so as to permit the railroads to compete with unregulated forms of transportation as recommended by the Federal Coordinator and covered in the Pettengill bill (H. R. 8100), introduced at the last session of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

271. Also, petition of the Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, Springfield Division, No. 166, by their secretary, H. B. Poland, requesting by their body, consisting of 229 railway employees, exclusive of their families, to support to the fullest extent enactment of legislation to modify the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act to regulate commerce so as to permit the railroads to compete with unregulated forms of transportation as recommended by the Federal Coordinator and covered in the Pettengill bill (H. R. 8100), introduced at the last session of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

272. Also, petition of the Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, Cleveland Division, No. 98, by their secretary, C. H. Boysen, requesting by their body, consisting of 808 railway employees, exclusive of their families, to support to the fullest extent enactment of legislation to modify the

fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act to regulate commerce so as to permit the railroads to compete with unregulated forms of transportation as recommended by the Federal Coordinator and covered in the Pettengill bill (H. R. 8100), introduced at the last session of Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

273. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of Blanches M. Sprung, Dora Martin, Hattie Snyder, Marie Wylie, and about 75 other members of the Farmers' Profit and Pleasure Club of Dilworth, Minn., requesting the enactment of the Townsend old-age revolving pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

274. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the county of Milwaukee, favoring passage of the so-called "Lundeen bill"; to the Committee on Labor.

275. Also, petition of the Negro Labor News Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

276. Also, petition of the city of Cambridge, supporting payment of the veterans' bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

277. Also, petition of the Police Jury Association of Louisiana; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

278. Also, petition of the Louisiana Bottlers Association; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

279. Also, petition of the Louisiana Motor Transportation Association; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 21, 1935

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who by the miracle of light hast brought again the earth out of nightly shadows into new hours of beauty and delight, grant that this day, wherein a wondrous duty lies, may see fulfilled the hope and expectation of our country, for with Thy inner voice to guide us we shall find Thy praise sufficient crown.

Search us, O God, and know our hearts; try us and know our thoughts, and see if there be any wicked way in us; and lead us in the way everlasting, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, January 18, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Connally	Hayden	Pittman
Ashurst	Coolidge	Johnson	Pope
Austin	Copeland	Keyes	Radcliffe
Bachman	Costigan	King	Reynolds
Bailey	Couzens	La Follette	Robinson
Bankhead	Cutting	Lewis	Russell
Barbour	Davis	Logan	Schall
Barkley	Dickinson	Lonergan	Schwellenbach
Bilbo	Dieterich	McCarran	Sheppard
Black	Donahey	McGill	Smith
Bone	Duffy	McNary	Steiwer
Borah	Fletcher	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Frazier	Metcalf	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Gerry	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Glass	Moore	Trammell
Burke	Gore	Murphy	Truman
Byrd	Guffey	Murray	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hale	Neely	Van Nuys
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Wagner
Caraway	Hastings	Nye	Walsh
Clark	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wheeler

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] is absent in the Philippines on the business of the Senate; that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] is unavoidably detained; and that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] is absent on account of a death in his family.

I wish also to announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily absent. I ask that these announcements stand for the day.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], occasioned by illness.

I again announce the absence of the Senator from California [Mr. MCADOO], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator-elect from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] in connection with the Philippine Commission.

I desire further to announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia, and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDMENTS TO COMMUNICATIONS ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, on behalf of the Commission, pursuant to section 4 (k) of the Communications Act of 1934, recommendations for three proposed amendments to the Communications Act, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

OCTOBER REPORT OF FEDERAL EMERGENCY RELIEF ADMINISTRATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the secretary of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Administrator covering the period of October 1 to October 31, 1934, inclusive, which, with the accompanying report, was ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, memorializing Congress to promptly enact legislation to abolish the Federal gasoline sales tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. NORRIS.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Nebraska, memorializing Congress to provide effective Federal assistance to aid in controlling and eradicating field bindweed, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. NORRIS.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from James E. Hughes, of Cambridge, Md., praying for the enactment of old-age pension legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the ratification of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Deep Waterway Treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lafontaine, Kans., praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution of Beloit Post, No. 57, the American Legion, of Beloit, Kans., favoring the enactment of the four-point program of the American Legion and the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.